

magnitude of this undertaking, almost \$17 billion.

Now, during these hearings we will go into many facets of our defense posture. Among other things, we will ascertain the status of the Vinson-Trammell Act.

And I intend to determine the position of the Department of Defense with respect to the 65-35 language affecting ship repairs and conversions which is now contained in the Defense Appropriation Act, for the last 2 or 3 years, I think.

Now, as members of this committee, you will receive and hear a great deal of highly classified information. Whenever we are to hear witnesses presenting classified information, we will go into executive session.

It will be our policy to hold as many of our hearings in open session as is humanly possible, always keeping in mind the nature of the information we receive during these hearings.

Before we go into the business of formally organizing the committee, I would like to stress one very significant point. While there are 25 members of the majority and 12 members of the minority, this is a nonpartisan committee in every sense of the word.

We all have one goal in mind—the maintenance of our national security.

For the 18 years that I have been a member of this committee, I have been impressed with the outstanding cooperation that has always existed between the majority and

minority, regardless of the party in power. I know that Mr. ARENDS, as ranking minority member for several Congresses, cooperated fully with Mr. Vinson in every respect. And I am quite confident that Mr. BATES, as the new ranking minority member, will continue the complete cooperation that we have enjoyed in the past.

We are not Republicans or Democrats on this committee—we are Members of Congress working here as a team to attain a common goal—the security and safety of the Nation.

I hope that this spirit of nonpartisanship will always continue to prevail because there is no room for politics in national defense matters.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Harry W. Campbell, Epworth Memorial Methodist Church, South Bend, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, Thou knowest our need for the gifts which make public service bearable. Give Thy servants wisdom, courage, and far vision so that hard tasks may be done, and the pursuit of liberty and justice seem worth the chase. Keep us in good humor, so that the tensions of our time may not break us. Keep us in balance on the fine edge of duty, so that we will not neglect those who love us most, or differ among ourselves on issues without substance. Aid us to take the time, now and then, to look up and be excited by the land, the flag, and the dream which broods over us all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 701. An act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall in the Senate during the 80th and 81st Congresses.

DR. EARTHA WHITE WINNING ON NEW PROJECT AT 88

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently been notified by the Florida Development Commission's Hospital Con-

struction Department that the Mercy Hospital and Nursing Home, Inc., of Jacksonville, Fla., a nonprofit group, has had its application for Hill-Burton matching funds approved.

In Florida we are proud of our hospital and nursing home program, which has been helped greatly by Hill-Burton aid, administered by the Florida Development Commission.

There is no program, however, that has been approved in the State of Florida, or perhaps anywhere, which exceeds the kind of wonderful spirit and background with which the Mercy Hospital and Nursing Home is endowed.

The founder of the Mercy Hospital and Nursing Home is Dr. Eartha M. M. White, who recently celebrated her 88th birthday. Dr. White has long been a leader in Jacksonville, and is currently president of the Clara White Mission, Inc., named after her mother.

It is remarkable that Dr. White is beginning a new program of such magnitude and importance to her hometown. She is energetic and enthusiastic about this project, which will mean so much to Jacksonville. While others of her age are retired or inactive, Dr. White is working night and day to help make a better society. I doubt if there is another person in the whole country like Eartha White, my friend, and I want to take this opportunity to honor her with this tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, if it were not so tragic, the story of the closing of the veterans' hospitals throughout the United States unfolds like a great comic opera. For years I have heard the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, tell about funny money in the Federal Reserve System. Now I have become acquainted with funny bookkeeping within the Veterans' Administration.

When the announcement was made of the closing of the Veterans' Administra-

tion hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., one of the reasons given as justification was the high cost of patient care per day. However, upon checking the bookkeeping at the VA, I find included in the cost of patient care per day the maintenance and operation of a 1,500-grave cemetery which is located on the hospital property. Fort Bayard was originally a frontier outpost and the cemetery has been located there for about 100 years. I doubt that there is any medicare that can be devised to help these American citizens who are already in the Fort Bayard Cemetery nor do I believe this is a proper charge to be levied against the cost per patient at Fort Bayard Hospital.

Now, I cannot help but wonder how many other funny bookkeeping systems will be uncovered when hearings are held by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] on the closing of these hospitals.

FEDERAL RESERVE ACTION ON DISCOUNT RATES

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper reports indicate that Federal Reserve officials are currently recommending a tightening of credit presumably through the use of the customary tool of increased discount rates. This would result in higher bank interest rates at a time when lending institutions are overwhelmed with cash accumulations.

Why should the Federal Reserve be used to prop up interest charges when free market conditions would tend to develop into reduced interest charges to the American consumer.

The manipulation of the interest rate is the least effective device in the balance-of-payments problem. It could have devastating effect upon small business which does not have the capacity to generate adequate internal financing. It would add an interest surcharge on consumer goods which could upset stable prices in the United States, which are even more vital to our internal economy than the pressing problems of gold outflow.

Perhaps it is time to review our tax laws which provide lush tax advantages in foreign investments of American capital.

POLLUTION OF THE WATERS OF LAKE ERIE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, for two centuries the waters of Lake Erie have supplied the lifeblood for the stream of commerce that has built Buffalo into a great world port.

But, sad to say, much of this bright, sparkling water would—if bottled today—have to be labeled with the skull and crossbones, for detergents, pesticides, sewage, and industrial wastes have polluted our beautiful waters. And if this massive pollution continues unchecked, it could mean death to people, shipping, industry, and recreation.

Since this is such a grave problem in the district I represent, I sought and was assigned to a seat on the Public Works Committee. And today I joined my distinguished Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], in introducing legislation to attack the pollution which today menaces not only Lake Erie but most of America's streams, rivers, and lakes.

I should now like to bring my colleagues' attention to an illuminating speech on this subject by the Assistant Interior Secretary Briggs:

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FRANK P. BRIGGS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AT A MEETING OF THE OHIO COMMERCIAL FISHERMAN'S ASSOCIATION IN VERMILION, OHIO, ON SATURDAY, JUNE 20, 1964

Having been a midwestern newspaperman longer than I care to admit, I have always had a kind feeling toward the Great Lakes, especially for beautiful Lake Erie traditionally the most productive of the five. It has supplied the millions of citizens along its shores—fish for angling, fish for commercial operations, and fish for the public food supply.

It has offered vast stretches of public beaches, and has provided attractive waters for boating and recreation.

Your cities and industries have grown and prospered because of its ready supply of water. Few lakes have been used as Lake Erie.

But, have we used this lake wisely?

Are we proud to pass on to the next generation this same lake from which this area as well as this Nation has benefited so greatly?

The regretful answer to these questions must be a shameful "no." Conditions in Lake Erie today are deplorable—almost desperate. They are rapidly growing worse and I can see no immediate reversal of trend.

Let us review briefly what has happened and what is happening to the waters of Lake Erie and then turn to the present and projected consequences.

Man's activities along Lake Erie and its tributaries are hastening the time scale and pushing Lake Erie into a premature senility.

All lakes age naturally, but here we are packing into a short decade aging that would take nature centuries to consummate.

Fertility in modest measure is useful but we are making Lake Erie fertile so fast that conditions are rapidly approaching devastation.

This is not a matter of surmise of casual observation—it is a matter of scientific record.

The greatest changes in the populations of fish and fish food organisms have occurred during the past 10 to 15 years. These changes have taken place during the period of greatly increased use of detergents and pesticides. Consequently, increased fertility may not be the only factor involved in changes in the lake, and the effects of detergents and pesticides must be considered.

I am no chemist—and neither, I think, are most of you—but I would like to lay down a few basic facts.

We have good chemical records that go back to the turn of the century. Let me give a few examples: From 1900 to 1960, the concentration of calcium in Lake Erie water has increased 24 percent, sodium and potassium 69 percent, sulfates 85 percent, and chlorides 230 percent. The rise of chlorides is especially significant for it is a sound indicator of pollution by domestic sewage.

Domestic sewage also is clearly indicated as the principal source of enrichment and pollution of Lake Erie that we can document, since no work has yet been done on pesticides, detergents and other toxic substances. The process has long been underway, but it has increased by leaps and bounds with the rapid growth of human population and now it is reaching critical levels.

I shall not belabor you with detailed figures, but let me give one or two examples. The sewage and industrial waste together from the Detroit metropolitan area contribute over a million pounds per day of suspended solids to the Detroit River—and that is in addition to vast amounts of dissolved solids.

Add to this load the sewage from the almost uninterrupted urban and suburban area which extends from Toledo eastward through Cleveland and Erie to Buffalo and the total suspended solids introduced to the lake each day, probably, is in excess of 2 million pounds.

Other industrial wastes such as petroleum derivatives, strong acids, or heavy metals are directly toxic to aquatic life. Others may simply enrich or make undue demands on the supply of oxygen in the water.

The effects on lake temperatures of the almost 3 billion gallons of water used per year for cooling condensers in power-generating plants are largely unknown; additional thermal pollution is sure to come from the new atomic power plant below the mouth of the Detroit River.

Agriculture, too, has made its contribution of toxic substances such as pesticides. In addition, drainage from heavily fertilized lands adds significantly to the nutrients in the lake.

Again, Erie's four major tributaries alone carry 2.6 million tons of silt into the lake annually.

The impact of these substances man has added to Lake Erie has been devastating.

Some of the effects we cannot actually see.

As we ride across the surface of the lake few of us realize that the mayflies, once a principal fish food, have largely disappeared to be replaced by sludge worms and midge larvae. How many of you realize that vast areas of bottom water each year become utterly devoid of the dissolved oxygen that is so essential to life?

We may not be aware of these changes, but the fishes are.

In the fish we do have a clear and distressing measure of our handiwork.

In 1953, just 10 years ago, Lake Erie yielded almost 28 million pounds of fish—good fish, excellent fish.

Last year, this same lake yielded about 18 million pounds of fish.

While the change in total pounds may seem significant, the facts are more dramatic when we realize that the present-day catch is not the previous high-priced preferred fish but is predominantly described as "trash" fish.

What has happened to the cisco which once dominated commercial catches? It is now a zoological rarity.

What about the gourmet item among Great Lakes fishes, the whitefish? Also gone.

The sauger—gone.

The blue pike—gone.

The walleye is at a tiny fraction of its former abundance.

Look most any direction today and you can see other evidences of pollution—signs on beaches that read, "Closed; Unsafe for Bathing"—and quite a few suspect that many beaches not yet closed fall short of good minimum standards of safety.

What of the small-boat operator? He must see that his children do not drink the polluted water and, in many areas, the refreshing dip overside is a fading memory.

Lake Erie still supplies good drinking water for its bordering communities though the water intakes are pushed farther and farther from shore.

Technologists at city waterplants do a superb job of straining out the sewage and killing off bacteria. Yet, even they have their problems with viruses. Evidence grows that epidemics of such ailments as hepatitis have originated from such treated water supplies.

Water intakes may have to be pushed even farther from these major sources of pollution. We may see a shadow of the future at Detroit which is now pushing a pipeline some 60 miles to a safer source of water in southern Lake Huron. Accounts say this is costing the city a neat \$98 million—a rather stiff price to pay for man's thoughtless pollution of beautiful Lake Erie.

I must say in honesty that the outlook immediately ahead is not too bright for those interested in Lake Erie for angling, commercial fishing, boating, and swimming unless positive action is taken to redeem the lake from the debris under which we are burying it.

Both anglers and commercial fishermen will have to do for a while with what is now available.

Commercial operators in particular will need to improve methods of catching, handling, processing, and marketing—in short, learn to squeeze out a better margin from a pound of fish.

The high priced species now so scarce are not likely soon to be plentiful for more than short periods in the foreseeable future.

Boatmen cannot hope for improved water, and swimmers can anticipate the further closing of beaches. City water departments may face growing difficulties.

We are now confronted with this problem.

We cannot tolerate having Lake Erie, already badly polluted, deteriorate to a veritable cesspool.

At the same time, we know that we have a vigorous, expanding culture. We shall have more industry, more intensive agriculture, and more people.

We cannot reduce sewage by a return to the backyard privy and the garbage hole; we cannot reforest all our farmlands; we cannot dismantle our factories and powerplants. Yet, we must reduce pollution of the lake if it is to continue to be useful.

Is this problem without solution? No.

Will it be complex and difficult and require long-term research and development? Yes.

Will the solution be costly? Yes, but the reward will be great.

I cannot tell you how the problem will be solved, but solved it must be and solved it will be.

I have every confidence that a culture that has produced the scientific breakthroughs and the fabulous technical developments of recent decades can handle our Lake Erie problem.

First, we must realize that it is not a problem of the sport or commercial fishermen, of yachtsmen, of swimmers, of waterplant technologists, of owners of industrial plants, of public health officials but rather is a problem of the entire Lake Erie community—no exceptions.

The future of this region depends upon—requires—demands a solution.

If we delay our start longer, we may be in the position of a young prizefighter I once knew. He had been taking a beating for eight rounds. When he came back to his corner his second cautioned, "As it stands now, you gotta knock that guy out to get a draw."

Now is not the time for mutual recrimination or conservative procrastination. We must lend our joint support to immediate action. The more we delay, the greater will be everyone's injury. I believe, and I am sincere in the belief, that what man has polluted—man can reclaim.

I believe that Lake Erie can, and that Lake Erie will, be returned to a clean, sparkling lake where flora and fauna will abide in goodly numbers and man will be able to enjoy a generous portion of the fishing rewards of yesterday.

But we can't do that by mere wishful thinking.

We must act, and we must act now, to stop this infernal pollution.

We must find new dumping grounds for our wastes and we must find them now.

We must realize that clean water is as necessary to life as is clean air and clean food, and we must realize that now.

WASHINGTON CONFERENCE OF DIRECT MAIL ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure for me to attend yesterday the breakfast of the Washington conference of the Direct Mail Advertising Association at the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

The Postmaster General, the Honorable John A. Gronouski, was the principal speaker, and I should like to commend to my colleagues the Postmaster General's fine address.

Mr. Gronouski explained certain features of the Post Office Department's continuing program to provide for more efficient handling of bulk second- and third-class mail. Pointing out the great and growing burden placed on local post offices by the necessity of sorting vast amounts of bulk material, Mr. Gronouski said that his responsibility to provide the best possible service at the lowest possible cost has prompted the decision to initiate a program of mandatory presorting by ZIP code for bulk second- and third-class mailers.

The full text of Mr. Gronouski's address follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL

We are living in a time of change.

And change is demanding and often painful. Old customs and habits are wiped away. Familiar surroundings disappear. Comfortable routines are disrupted. Accepted theories are demolished overnight.

But each change offers an opportunity as well as a challenge. If we are wise and bold and imaginative, we can bend it to our advantage.

If not—if we resist it and cling to past ways, because it is easier to do so—the tide of events will surely overwhelm us. The formidable dinosaur disappeared from the face of the earth because it could not adapt itself to a changing environment. And, if we in this age have the advantages of intelligence and choice that the dinosaur lacked, we do not have the benefit of a million years to make up our minds. The crush of events is upon us, and the opportunity is gone almost before we know it is there.

Consider the revolution that has taken place in the area of customer relations in 20 short years. Two decades ago, the motto of American retailers was "Service with a smile," and the public demanded that service as a matter of course. We were waited on by clerks behind every counter—and the merchandise we bought was delivered to our door. Today, the motto is "Serve yourself," and we have seen just the beginning. Now, people select their own food in supermarkets, flock to self-service department and drugstores, park their own cars, and operate their own elevators. There are even indications they may soon be pumping their own gas. They get their own coffee and soft drinks out of vending machines, write out their own trip insurance and rent their own trucks.

The days of the carriage trade are over. The age of self-service is upon us.

But there are advantages of self-service, as well as demands. The customer is asked to do part of the work, but he saves money in the process. The pre-packaged cut of meat is cheaper than the one the butcher has to specially prepare.

Perhaps the best example of the benefits that accrue from self-service has been provided by the telephone company. In past years, when you wanted to call long distance, you asked the operator to dial it for you. Today, you dial it yourself. And the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. was recently able to announce a rate reduction for long-distance calls.

All this is in recognition of the fact that today's labor is too dear a commodity to waste on actions that the customer can do himself. That is one of the basic economic truths of our time, and the businessman who ignores it does so at his own peril.

Today, the revolution of self-service has caught up with the Post Office Department, and the decision is mine whether to ignore it or to accept it as a welcome opportunity. Either way, the decision must be made—and it must be made now.

Since I last spoke to you, a year ago, our mail volume has soared by 2 billion pieces. Our annual rate of 72 billion pieces is half as much as the rest of the world's combined volume. Since 1940, it has increased by 166 percent.

This is what we call the "mail explosion." And the main contributing factor to this mail explosion has been the sharp rise in business mail, which accounts for 80 percent of today's volume. Last year, our volume of second-class mail was 8½ billion pieces. And third class amounted to another 18½ billion pieces. Together, they totaled a record 27 billion pieces—39 percent of our overall volume.

And yet, despite this fantastic growth, we are using the same system of sorting and

handling the mail as we did 25 years ago. It is cumbersome and slow. It is also prohibitively expensive. In 1932, a 3-cent stamp paid for nearly 2 minutes of a postal employee's time. Today's 5-cent stamp covers less than a minute of his time.

If we continue along this road, if we continue to ignore the economic facts of life, if we close our eyes to the advantages of modern technology—in other words, if we keep adding thousands of new employees each year to handle the swelling mail volume, I can guarantee you what the results will be:

First, our service would deteriorate because no matter how many employees we have, we would be unable to keep the mail from logjamming in our major metropolitan areas.

And second, our rates would go up, and up, and up.

In other words, you, the American mailer, would be paying more and enjoying it less.

I cannot allow this to happen. If I did, you would be the first to say I had failed in my public trust—and you would be right. My responsibility is to provide the best possible postal service at the lowest possible cost, and I intend to fulfill that responsibility.

And so I have come here today to spell out to you the only practical solution to our present-day postal problems: modernization of our 1926 second- and third-class presorting regulations to conform to the ZIP code program.

It might be noted that this represents the first significant change in those regulations in nearly 40 years, and it is long overdue.

First, let me say that the program I am about to outline for you is not one which has been hastily thought out. In reaching our final conclusions, we were guided as much by your problems as we were our own; as much by the economic realities in the industry as by the economic pressures on the postal service. I might mention that the questionnaires sent out and compiled by your association and others provided us with an invaluable yardstick in this regard. We were hopeful, for example, that we could have the entire industry completely ZIP coded and presorting within 6 months—or within a year at the outside. This would have represented a tremendous savings to us at a time when even the smallest savings are vital. But after studying the reactions of your members, we decided it just didn't give bulk mailers enough time. We also considered a proposal to make an extra charge for un-ZIP coded bulk mail after next January 1, but again, we listened to you and decided against it.

We believe, then, that the program we have come up with is a modest one, representing the fairest possible compromise between the pressures on you and the pressures on us.

The regulations will go into effect in two steps.

Starting July 1 of this year, we are going to require second- and third-class bulk mailers—meaning those who enjoy a rate differential—to presort by sectional centers some of the mail they are now massing at State distribution points. By "some of the mail" I mean those bundles which would make up a third of a sack per sectional center but which would not constitute enough for a direct shipment to individual cities. The remainder you will send in a State sack as before. This also will have no effect on shipments now going directly to cities and carrier stations.

I think you will agree with me that this is a modest requirement. It is something you can do now to help relieve part of our mail congestion. And although it is modest, it will mean a considerable savings to us.

Actually, it affects only a few hundred or so of our 275,000 second- and third-class bulk mailers—and it requires very little of them.

At the present time, third-class mailers are required to make up their mail in bundles if there are 10 or more pieces going to the same city. For second-class mailers the bundle requirement is six or more pieces to the same city.

Under present regulations, when there are enough of these bundles to any one city to fill a third of a sack, the mailers send it direct. The rest they put in State sacks for a single distribution point. What we are now attempting to do is alleviate the congestion at these State distribution points by diverting some of these bundles to our 566 sectional centers.

The only new requirement this will place on bulk mailers is to know what sectional center serves each city and town he is mailing to, to mark the proper sectional center on the top of each bundle, and then, if there are enough bundles to a given sectional center, to sack them separately and send them direct.

In most cases, there will be at least one piece of mail for each bundle which is already ZIP coded. All the mailer has to do is put the sectional center number on top to identify the bundle and put the bundle in the corresponding sack. If there is no ZIP coded mail in a bundle, the mailer will have to look up the number—but only the first time if he makes up some tags for future use.

That is the preliminary step in our new regulations. It is modest, but it is important to us.

The second step will require all bulk second- and third-class mail to be completely ZIP coded by January 1, 1967—that's 23 months from now—and presorted by all five numbers. Any un-ZIP coded mail after that time will be subject to the single piece rate. Here is how the program will work:

You will continue to bundle your mail as before—on the basis of 10 pieces or more for third-class and six or more for second-class—but you will be required to make up bundles for delivery units, post offices, and sectional centers.

If you have enough mail with the same five ZIP code numbers to fill a third of a sack, you will presort it and send it direct to the carrier station.

Of the remainder, you will presort, sack, and send direct that mail which makes up a third of a sack to the same city post office.

Of the mail still remaining, you will presort that which makes up a bundle or third of a sack to a sectional center.

All the rest you will presort and bundle by sectional center, but send it in a State sack.

This is the very heart of our ZIP code program. In my opinion, it is the most far-reaching single postal innovation of the 20th century. Since we are now drafting legislation to require presorting by all large volume mailers, including first class, we will be in a good position to handle any volume of business mail this Nation can generate—and handle it speedily, efficiently, and economically. Under ZIP code, we will be moving well over 50 percent of the Nation's mail without even unbagging it until it reaches its destination area.

This, then, is our blueprint for the future. The decisions have been made. We are now asking for your cooperation and your support.

I would be foolish to believe that these decisions will be unanimously popular. Some large volume mailers are not going to find them to their liking. But I must say in all candor that they would like the alternative even less. And make no mistake about it, the alternative is a sizable rate increase now—and a succession of such increases in the years to come. I look upon mandatory presorting by ZIP code as a stitch in time; inconvenient for a short time, perhaps, but an inconvenience which will save mailers countless millions of dollars in the long run.

I think if you look at it from this point of view, you will agree with me that it is the only realistic course we can take.

I know, too, there are those of you who would prefer a rate increase over a mandatory presorting program, thinking it would be cheaper in the long run. But again, I ask you to remember that without ZIP code, we are not talking about one increase, but a whole series of them to keep up with our rising costs.

As you probably know, I have established an advisory panel, made up of distinguished members of the American business and labor communities, to conduct a thorough study of this whole rate question and to assist me in making my recommendations to President Johnson. Certainly, I would not want to prejudice the conclusions of that panel by making any premature recommendations on my own. But I think you should understand that the more efficiencies we develop with your cooperation, the more modest the increase will be—should there be one at all.

In the meantime, we in the Post Office Department are doing our share to save money whenever and wherever possible.

We are now preparing legislation which would permit us to lease automobiles for our 31,000 rural letter carriers in lieu of the present method of paying them 12 cents a mile. Studies show that we can save between \$25 and \$30 million annually under this program alone.

We are also looking into the possibility of direct post office construction of our large post offices—a program which we believe will result in a cost savings of hundreds of millions of dollars over the years.

We are forging ahead with our vertical improved mail program in high-rise office buildings. VIM, as this program is called, employs a sophisticated system of vertical conveyors to deliver office building mail and it is to our carrier costs what presorting is to our sorting costs.

And finally, we are carrying forward our mechanization in those post offices where such a program can really be effective; in other words, where the mail volume justifies it. One of the most important developments in this area is the development of an optical scanner which is capable of "reading" ZIP codes on envelopes and then sorting those envelopes at the rate of 35,000 an hour. This machine will represent a tremendous breakthrough in our efforts to process mail that has not been presorted, and I am happy to say that we plan to install the first one in a major post office within a year.

So this is not a one-way street. We are asking for your cooperation to hold down our costs, but we are making a gigantic effort ourselves.

But I want to make it clear to you that we are talking about more than saving you money when we ask you to presort by ZIP code. We are talking about improved service, as well. As I said earlier, my responsibility is to provide not only mail service at the lowest possible cost, but the best possible mail service as well. And there is no question but that presorting will speed your mail by allowing it to bypass terminal stops and go direct to its destination area.

And even then we will not be satisfied. I want to tell you that as long as I am Postmaster General, I will spare no effort to give you the kind of service you want and deserve.

Just yesterday, I met with our volume mailer committee to seek new ways of providing that service. This is a continuing voluntary committee made up of leaders from the mailing industry—including a representative of your own association—which meets with the technical people and executives of the Post Office Department to discuss problems of mutual interest. It is strictly a working committee, the success of which

will depend on the freedom of its members to speak frankly and openly.

The existence of this committee goes back to the statement I made at the beginning of my speech. The age of self-service is upon us. If we approach tomorrow with a sense of unity and cooperation, there are no problems which we cannot solve.

There is no other way to do it.

MEDAL OF HONOR FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, 72 of my colleagues recently joined with me in introducing a bill which would permit awarding the Congressional Medal of Honor to our late President and Commander in Chief, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

These proposals would recognize John Kennedy not only for his peerless leadership as head of the Nation's Armed Forces, but also for his heroic courage as a pioneer of freedom, his gallant and unselfish devotion to the service of his country, and his everlasting contribution to the cause of world peace.

The life of John Kennedy is certainly symbolized by the Navy Medal of Honor which carries the figure of Minerva—the Union—and the words "wise in the industries of peace and in the arts of war."

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on the Judiciary will take note of the support which this proposal has already received and give it prompt and favorable consideration so that it may move quickly to the floor.

I suspect that across the country there will be a smattering of people—a very small minority if my mail to date is a reflection—who may not be pleased with swift action on this proposal. Yes, I regret that there may be some who will not agree that our fallen leader deserves the Medal of Honor, who will argue against it on narrow partisan or sectional grounds.

I predict that the dissidents will continue to be small in number, a prediction based not only upon my mail but on the fact that the bill's sponsors include Republicans as well as Democrats, liberals as well as conservatives, northerners as well as southerners, easterners as well as westerners. They are men and women of the Union who have put political and sectional quarrels aside, who have recognized without fear or favor that John Fitzgerald Kennedy was not the President of one party or of one region, but of the entire Nation.

The relatively few dissidents in the land, of course, will not openly admit that their objections are based on petty motives. They undoubtedly will claim that John Kennedy did not possess the qualities demanded by the Medal of Honor.

They will probably argue that he lacked courage—conveniently forgetting his great courage both as a lieutenant in

the Pacific war of two decades ago and as Commander in Chief during the Cuban missile crisis of only 2 years ago.

The dissidents may also allege that John Kennedy contributed nothing to world peace—again conveniently forgetting his success in obtaining the limited nuclear test ban treaty, heralded around the globe as a first step forward in man's quest of a world without war.

To those who would forget the record of John Fitzgerald Kennedy I quote in part a resolution adopted by numerous chapters of the Disabled American Veterans, an organization of former fighting men who have spilled their blood on the field of battle:

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy served the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war with exceptional honor, distinction, and heroism, all beyond the call of duty; and

Whereas he continued to devote his life to the service of his country as a Member of the House of Representatives, and as a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy became President of the United States, and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the Nation; and

Whereas in November 1963 President John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave his life in the service of our country; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy personified all of the qualities called for in the awarding of this Nation's highest military decoration and honor: Be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States (is urged) to seriously consider the posthumous awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who gave the full measure of devotion to his country in the never ceasing battle for the freedom and equality of all men everywhere.

The dissidents may have forgotten John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Mr. Speaker, but we can all be grateful that the Disabled American Veterans do not have short memories.

I suspect, too, that when the dissidents discover the futility of challenging the courage and patriotism of John Kennedy they will fall back to a false front of nit-picking.

They will likely argue that our late President was not in the Army or Navy when he gave his life on that dark November day. But again the dissidents forget. They forget that according to the Constitution he was the "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

And they may argue that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not die in direct combat with the enemy. But they forget. They forget that as Commander in Chief he could never escape—not even for a moment—from the front line of combat. His was the ultimate responsibility on all battlefields, hot and cold, at home and abroad, on which we are committed around the globe.

To our everlasting sorrow John Kennedy's last battlefield was a street in Dallas. The fact that he wore no military uniform did not remove him from the gunsight of a nonuniformed advocate of Communism.

Mr. Speaker, I also suspect that when those who would deny John Kennedy his Nation's highest military honor find their argumentative barricades have crum-

bled before them, they will retreat to the trenches of what they mistakenly believe is "law and precedent."

I submit, however, that they have failed to learn either the law or precedent. The statute authorizing the Navy Medal of Honor for men who distinguish themselves by "gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty involving actual combat with the enemy" also states that the medal may be awarded for those who show similar gallantry "in the line of their profession."

This latter provision has not lain dormant. On several occasions Congress has chosen to confer the award on those who have, in the line of their profession, gone into combat against fear and the unknown.

Thus it was that Congress awarded the Medal of Honor to Charles Lindbergh for his courageous trans-Atlantic flight, to Richard Byrd for his daring exploration of the polar regions, to Billy Mitchell for his broad foresight in the field of aerial combat, and to Adolphus Greely for his life of splendid public service which began as an Army private and ended as a major general.

It would seem that law and precedent have routed the dissidents from the shelter of the trenches.

Mr. Speaker, I would also make one other point at this time. Among the purposes of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society—and I hasten to emphasize that the society does not participate in politics nor does it lend its support for the purpose of obtaining special legislative considerations—is "to inspire and stimulate our youth to become worthy citizens of our country" and "to foster and perpetuate Americanism."

Who more than John Kennedy has met this criteria in this generation?

Who among us—young and old, rich and poor—still does not hear his crisp voice sparring the cold January air 4 years ago:

Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service are found around the globe.

Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are; but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in, and year out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And so my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country.

With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have joined in this legislative effort to award

the Medal of Honor now ask the Congress to join with history as the final judge of John F. Kennedy's deeds.

PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT REMARKS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN TRIBUTE TO SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, Monday I introduced a House concurrent resolution which calls for the printing as a House document remarks by Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate in the Congress of the United States, which constitute tributes to the late Sir Winston Churchill.

These remarks would be printed and bound as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, 10 copies of such document for use by each Member of the House of Representatives and 15 copies for use by each Member of the Senate.

This House document would become a tangible symbol of the gratitude of the American people for the life of Winston Churchill and the contributions which he made during that life of fourscore years and ten. It will also be a reminder to us that more than that of any single person, his courage, his faith, and his indomitable will provided the leadership which led the United States, Great Britain, and our Allies to victory in World War II.

As the outstanding Briton of this century, as an honorary citizen of the United States, and as an outstanding leader of the free world, Winston Churchill merits this last tribute which we, the Congress, can bestow upon him.

I hope that this resolution will be favorably considered by the House of Representatives.

VOTE ON AID TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a newspaper release of the Republican congressional campaign committee, which is one of the lowest, most reprehensible, most contemptible acts of any individual or group in my knowledge. The release is headed, "GOP Criticizes Rogers for Vote To Help Nasser." The release quotes Bob Wilson of California, as stating that I voted against the best interests of the United States and on behalf of a Middle East dictator. This statement and conclusion I brand as a deliberate lie, and I would include in that category any one of the Republican congressional

campaign committee who was associated with this action or knew about it. In my opinion the only thing lower or more contemptible than the act itself would be the people responsible for it. It was, without doubt, the most irresponsible, unconscionable, and fraudulent act that I have witnessed in my experience since I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States of America.

The smear campaign that is being carried on by this Republican congressional campaign committee under the chairmanship of Bob WILSON is nothing more than a cheap, sordid attempt to misinform and mislead the public by distortions of fact, misstatements, half-truths, and outright lies. I serve notice here and now that if this group is to continue this nefarious and infamous practice I shall expect to meet it head-on with the truth and to expose its villainess on the floor of this House. I would hope that the members of the Republican congressional campaign committee, including Bob WILSON, its chairman, would exhibit at least some semblance of honesty, decency, and gentility by ceasing and desisting from this sorry practice that so resembles the Communist propaganda methods. However, if it is war they want, and they intend to continue their attempts at character assassination and to try to drag the names of Members of this Congress into the dirt, then I here and now serve notice on them that it is war they will have.

The truth about the vote on House Joint Resolution 234 is quite simple. It was a resolution making supplemental appropriation for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture. A Republican amendment was offered to the resolution which had all the earmarks of the rawest kind of political demagoguery, and in my opinion was designed for the sole purpose of trying to embarrass the President of the United States in the eyes of foreign nations, both friendly and hostile. The amendment had nothing to do with foreign aid but was confined to the question of sale of surplus farm commodities to the United Arab Republic for local currency. The foreign policy of this Nation is vested in the President of the United States under the Constitution. The sale of surplus farm commodities, on which this Government is paying storage, has been provided for under Public Law 480. This authority has been used as a weapon in foreign policy to get hold of local currencies without this country needing to use up any of its gold reserves for that purpose. The availability of local currencies to our Government is most important in dealing with all foreign nations. If we can obtain these currencies without spending gold, our position is strengthened and the drain on our gold reserves reduced.

The entire political situation in the Near East is highly explosive and must be dealt with on a day-to-day basis by the President of the United States. Not only the security of this Nation is involved, but also millions and millions of dollars of U.S. private capital invest-

ments. The Communists have long sought to gain control of the vast oil reserves under the control of the Arab countries. Nothing would please Nasser better than to be afforded a propaganda weapon which he could use to solidify the entire Arab world against the United States and subsequently justify himself in expropriating properties belonging to private investors of this country, turning these over to our Communist enemies, closing the Suez Canal and helping the Communists to gain additional power on the continent of Africa. This is also a weapon that could be used and no doubt would be, against the country of Israel and the Jews all over the world.

In my opinion the amendment that was offered was designed, not only for the purpose of embarrassing the President of the United States in the eyes of all foreign countries, but would take away from him a weapon that has been most effective in our conduct of foreign affairs and hand this weapon and more with it over to an untrustworthy, irresponsible, and despicable dictator in the Mideast. The vote on the amendment to House Joint Resolution 234 called for a choice between the President of the United States and Abdel Gamal Nasser, a Mideast dictator. Anytime this choice is offered me my vote will be cast for the President of the United States and this country, and let the chips fall where they may.

If my Republican friends want to demagog I would not deny them that right. However, I would hope in the future that they do not demagog with the security of this country or the private interests of U.S. citizens abroad.

CHRYSLER CORP. EXPANSION AT NEW CASTLE, IND.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to announce that I have received word by telephone today that the Chrysler Corp. has announced an expansion of 40 percent in their facilities at New Castle, Ind., a city located within the congressional district which it is my honor to represent and which is my home city.

Mr. Speaker, this is an area, interestingly enough, that has been classified as a depressed area in the past. It was so classified because a few years ago the Chrysler Corp. put through a revamping of their production processes, commonly called automation.

Mr. Speaker, this increased prosperity and expansion of the Chrysler Corp. facilities is evidence of the fact that these painful processes are usually self-healing.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the very extensive programs that Chrysler now has in operation and the increased prosperity to which we can look ahead in our area as the result of private enterprise,

the Chrysler Corp. is certainly to be congratulated on its fine record and efforts.

This follows closely on the announced program of expansion by Ingersoll Steel, a subsidiary of Borg-Warner. It, too, comes as a result of highly capable leadership and a favorable climate.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FIRE AND CASUALTY ACT

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of providing to the citizens of the District of Columbia and the many visitors to our Nation's Capital a vitally needed increased measure of protection against the all too many irresponsible motorists who infest our highways, I have today introduced a bill which greatly tightens up the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act in such a manner as to keep the dangerous, the reckless, and the financially irresponsible driver off our highways.

This bill, which in many ways parallels the proven and very successful law of my own State of Illinois would amend present District of Columbia law so as to:

First. Reduce from \$100 to \$50 the property damage necessary before an accident report is required, following which the uninsured driver would be required to post a minimum of \$500 security, such security to be kept on deposit for a minimum of 2 years and failure to deposit would entail suspension of license for at least 2 years or until claims are satisfied;

Second. Add a provision requiring proof of financial responsibility on the part of the owner of the auto involved in an accident as well as the operator, and maintain proof for 5 years;

Third. Provide for the suspension of both the license and registration of both the owner and operator of an uninsured vehicle involved in an accident or in a serious traffic violation if the requirements of the law are not met;

Fourth. Impose a \$25 fee for reinstatement of a suspended license; and

Fifth. Provide for the impoundment of an uninsured motorist's vehicle involved in an accident if the financial and security requirements cannot be met.

My decision to sponsor this approach to highway safety is dictated largely by the spiraling number of auto accidents here in our Nation's Capital which involve an increasing number of uninsured or financially irresponsible drivers. In too many cases involving an uninsured driver, the other motorist, property owner, or injured pedestrian is left holding the bag, unable to obtain restitution because many of the uninsured drivers simply are unable to pay. It follows, therefore, that our highways must be made untenable to the inept, reckless, and the financially irresponsible driver.

The District of Columbia authorities have revealed that approximately one-fourth of all the District of Columbia registered autos lack liability or property damage insurance and are involved in approximately one-fifth of all District of Columbia accidents.

My approach to highway safety takes a tack different from those States that require compulsory insurance. Compulsory insurance in the States requiring it has in many cases resulted in a sorry mess, accomplishing just the opposite of what was intended.

It is a matter of record that compulsory insurance tends to make the insured driver overconfident and apt to take more chances resulting in higher accident and injury rates; it leads to extreme and unwarranted claims and litigation; it leads to much higher individual premiums and administrative costs and it tends to lead many drivers to purchase only the absolute minimum amount of insurance required by law.

A second bill which I have introduced today complements the aforementioned Safety Responsibility Act amendments by amending the District of Columbia Fire and Casualty Act to provide that all auto insurance policies written in the District of Columbia include a provision for protection against uninsured motorists but only if the insured elects to carry such coverage—it would be purely optional.

I will seek hearings on these two important bills for the earliest possible date.

EXCISE TAX REPEAL

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to repeal the Federal excise tax on luggage, handbags, cosmetics, jewelry, and furs. These taxes were levied in 1941 and at that time had a twofold purpose: First, to raise revenue to aid the war effort; second, to discourage the purchase of such items so that the materials involved might be devoted to war purposes.

Almost 20 years have passed since the end of World War II and yet these taxes are still with us. For the consumers, it is a direct burden on their purchasing power. For the retailers, it constitutes an administrative burden since forms must be filed, records must be kept, and remittances made to the Treasury Department.

In view of this I, for one, was quite delighted that the President in his state of the Union message said:

More money will be left in the hands of the consumers by a substantial cut in excise taxes.

The Republican minority made this very point last year, but without success.

It is my hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will consider favorably

the matter and that we will have a chance to vote for it on the House floor in the near future.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 175

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Government Operations:
EDWARD J. GURNEY, of Florida.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:
JAMES T. BROTHILL, of North Carolina.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICIAL OBJECTORS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all I desire to advise the House that the official objectors on the Democratic side in this Congress will be as follows:

Consent Calendar: WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado, chairman; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts; and JOHN J. McFALL, California.

Private Calendar: EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts, chairman; ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Oregon; and JOHN W. DAVIS, Georgia.

BIRTHDAY OF THE HONORABLE JAMES W. TRIMBLE, ARKANSAS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I further advise the House that this is the birthday of a very prominent and beloved Member, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Every person who has served with Mr. TRIMBLE knows that there is no more able, conscientious or effective Member of this House. Every person who has known Mr. TRIMBLE, intimately or casually, has come to appreciate his fine qualities and to hold him in the deepest affection as well.

As the Speaker stated so appropriately this morning, JIM TRIMBLE is one of God's noblemen. All of us, I am sure, wish JIM a happy birthday, and many more happy birthdays in the years to come.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 4355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr.

TEAGUE of Texas; Mr. NATCHER, of Kentucky; Mr. LIPSCOMB, of California; Mr. PIRNIE, of New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 9355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS of Colorado; Mr. FLYNT, of Georgia; Mr. LAIRD, of Wisconsin; Mr. TALCOTT, of California.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 14, United States Code, section 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ST. ONGE, of Connecticut; Mr. WYATT, of Oregon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 46, United States Code, section 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. CAREY, of New York; Mr. MAILLIARD, of California.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RECORDING STUDIO

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 105(c), Public Law 624, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the House Recording Studio the following Members of the House: Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York; Mr. STEED, of Oklahoma; Mr. DEVINE, of Ohio.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a), Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the following members on the part of the House: Mr. HALEY, of Florida; Mr. MORRIS, of New Mexico; Mr. BERRY, of South Dakota.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 6, Public Law 754,

81st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Federal Records Council the following members on the part of the House: Mr. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, Mr. GROVER, of New York.

NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87-758, the Chair appoints as members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board the following members on the part of the House: Mr. KIRWAN, of Ohio; Mr. EDWARDS, of Alabama.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 6968(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FLOON, of Pennsylvania; Mr. FRIEDEL, of Maryland; Mr. MINSHALL, of Ohio; Mr. KING, of New York.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 3, 1965.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having transferred this year from subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has special jurisdiction over immigration legislation, it would be inappropriate for me to serve on the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy to which I was reappointed on February 1, 1965.

In accordance with custom, I hereby respectfully submit my resignation from the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. POFF.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

APPALACHIAN PROGRAM NEEDS CAREFUL LOOK

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in the rush to approve the multibillion-dollar Appalachian regional development program, few voices are being raised to caution "stop, look, and listen." Big business, big labor, and I would guess the majority of the big press of the country are either loud with praise or silent on this legislation. Temperate and reasoned voices are difficult to find.

Therefore, it was with a happy sense of discovery that I read the editorial on the subject printed in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, which appears following these remarks. The editorial was published before the vote in the other body. In one sentence, it stated:

Political pressures, therefore, are sure to call for vastly expanded amounts of Federal assistance.

This foresight was confirmed within hours when the other body adopted by voice vote an amendment expanding the potential scope of the program to 13 counties of New York State omitted from the original comprehension of this huge program. Other proposals to broaden the program to include wide regions at least equally deserving as the 13 counties in New York, were turned back, in the other body, although we may expect that they will come forth with their credentials in this House before we are done with the bill.

So political pressures are already much at work, diluting whatever clear streams of altruism that may have been flowing through the original bill.

The Wall Street Journal is to be complimented on this editorial and I urge all Members to read it.

THE GREATEST GROWTH CENTER

It has long been clear that the Government's approach to redevelopment of "depressed" areas has itself been in need of some redevelopment. But it is by no means clear that the changes under consideration will eliminate the program's more depressing aspects.

One mildly heartening development, noted in last week's Presidential Economic Report, is an indication of a certain disillusionment with the notion that just about any area can be revived if you inject enough Federal dollars into it. Up to now that old pork barrel theory has seemed to underlie most of Washington's redevelopment efforts.

In the short run, of course, the idea may often appear to work out. But the operations of the Area Redevelopment Administration have abundantly shown that merely feeding in Federal cash cannot restore health to an area lacking the manpower, material and natural resources on which a genuine revival might be built.

From now on, promises a Federal planner, quoted by Mr. Janssen in this newspaper recently, the Government will not be looking merely for the "neediest cases" but for those that "show the most potential for growth." That certainly sounds more sensible, and yet it provides no guarantee that aid will not continue to be based more on politics than on economics.

The politicking, in fact, may be expanded. Instead of concentrating on counties and similar smaller areas, the Government now proposes to make over whole regions, much as it is trying to uplift the 11-State "Appalachia" region in the East. So sweeping are

the plans that, as some officials see it, a program for upper New England might even move across the border to encompass Canada's maritime provinces.

Washington officials insist it's not their intent to remodel these huge regions on their own. They will rely largely on plans drawn up by State officials within the regions—though they add that the States must submit "rational plans." It's too early to tell whether the States definition of "rational" will always conform with Washington's.

Some questions of definition could arise when it comes to designating the "growth centers" which are to get the bulk of Federal aid. Practically every community considers itself a growth center and local pride isn't likely to be diminished by the prospect that such a designation will bring a Federal reward. If the community is important politically to the party in power in the State, is it probable that the State's officials will choose to pass it by?

What is much more likely is already indicated by the outlook in Appalachia. Though Federal officials expect to wind up with only about 50 growth centers in the area's 359 counties, they're talking of labeling a lot of the left-out localities secondary centers and scheduling them for somewhat smaller Federal help.

Political pressures, therefore, are sure to call for vastly expanded amounts of Federal assistance. Meanwhile, there is no assurance that the regional approach will be able to surmount the practical problems faced by the ARA or even to avoid all of its blunders.

To take one problem, the ARA has found that manpower and materials often must be imported from prosperous areas for projects in distressed communities, which certainly limits the local benefit of such activities. The ARA furthermore has sometimes helped set up companies to compete with existing firms which already were having trouble finding enough business to stay afloat. In short, the new approach may possess all of the practical and political pitfalls of the old.

Since a dynamic economy will always encompass areas that are declining and others that are on the rise, it stands to reason that few of those having strong potential for growth will long be overlooked by private business—or lack help from State and local governments. Many States and localities are, in fact, far along on such self-help, and they might do even more if Washington had not preempted so many of their tax sources.

Nonetheless, the administration apparently is convinced that no growth centers can properly grow without a lot of heavy-handed help from the Government. It's just that sort of thinking that has made Washington the greatest growth center of them all.

FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA—LEARNING TO DO, DOING TO LEARN

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last week to meet with Joseph Perrigo, a constituent of mine who has recently been selected as one of our four national vice presidents of the Future Farmers of America. He was in Washington for the meeting of the student board of officers of the Future Farmers of America.

This young man has taken a year's leave from his studies at the University of New Hampshire to serve this organization and its excellent program.

Joe is a well-qualified leader and spokesman for the Future Farmers, and a credit both to them and to his State, having served as vice president of the New Hampshire Future Farmers while in high school and as president of the body during his freshman year in college. With five other officers he will spend the next 6 weeks on a speaking tour of the eastern half of the country, talking to men of business and industry, after which he will spend the remainder of the year training Future Farmers throughout the North Atlantic region for leadership positions.

LEADERSHIP, COOPERATION AND CITIZENSHIP

The program of the Future Farmers aims at developing agricultural leadership, cooperation and citizenship. They encourage and help their members to develop their own individual farm programs, such as Joe has done at his family's 10,000 hen poultry farm in Weare, N.H. They encourage the members also to take an active interest in improving their farm homes and surroundings and to participate in activities that benefit agriculture and rural life. And for the development of the individual young man, they stress scholarship, thrift, and confidence in himself and his work. In New Hampshire, where most of our farms are relatively small family operations, the emphasis is on building and improving the facilities so that the family farm can retain its place in competition with the giant business-farmers. The Future Farmers also stress the place of the farm in the community and the responsibility of each individual to work in a spirit of cooperation in improving that community.

"DO-IT-YOURSELF" SPIRIT

The Future Farmers of America, although sponsored by the vocational education division of the Office of Education, is financed by the fundraising efforts of its members and by a foundation composed of businesses, industry and farm organizations. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this spirit of independence in itself is highly laudable and characteristic of the manner in which the group operates: local chapters support their activities by running concessions at sports events, selling magazine subscriptions and by raising and selling farm products.

The activities of the Future Farmers of America are carried on in conjunction with the classroom work in high school vocational agriculture classes. This learn-by-doing concept, along with the bookwork, keeps a good balance between the two necessities: learning techniques and methods on the spot and the kind of learning that will prepare them for living and thriving in a modern agricultural environment.

As Joe Perrigo pointed out in our talk, the farmer today must wear all the hats he used to—those of mechanic, veterinarian, biologist, retailer, administrator and accountant, but must add a few more. Today he must also be an espe-

cially adept businessman, advertiser, marketing expert, conservationist and chemist. Above all he must be imaginative, resourceful, and able to do for himself.

PUBLIC SPEAKING, RULES OF ORDER STRESSED

Development of aggressive rural leadership is an important goal. In order to prepare men for the positions of responsibility they will someday hold in their communities, all meetings are carried on with careful attention to the rules of parliamentary procedure. Public speaking contests are sponsored and the leadership of the program is left to the boys themselves, under careful adult guidance. Cooperation with other groups and assumption of responsibility are learned as they take part in community service projects. Here again they learn by doing.

The creed of the Future Farmers of America sums up a lot of important thoughts and beliefs, and its application transcends even the wide boundaries of agriculture:

THE FFA CREED

I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words but of deeds—achievements won by the present and past generations of farmers; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us from the struggles of former years.

I believe that to live and work on a good farm is pleasant as well as challenging; for I know the joys and discomforts of farm life and hold an inborn fondness for those associations which, even in hours of discouragement, I cannot deny.

I believe in leadership from ourselves and respect from others. I believe in my own ability to work efficiently and think clearly, with such knowledge and skill as I can secure, and in the ability of organized farmers to serve our own and the public interest in marketing the product of our toil. I believe we can safeguard those rights against practices and policies that are unfair.

I believe in less dependence on begging and more power in bargaining; in the life abundant and enough honest wealth to help make it so—for others as well as myself; in less need for charity and more of it when needed; in being happy myself and playing square with those whose happiness depends upon me.

I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture and rural life are basic to our American heritage and essential to our economy. Young men like Joe Perrigo and the men who work with the Future Farmers as advisers are making an invaluable contribution to our Nation's future and the way of life we cherish. The laudable goals to which these young men dedicate their efforts is best expressed in their own motto: "Learning to do, doing to learn; earning to live, living to serve."

CITY OF MANCHESTER, N.H., FORMALLY PROTESTS VA CUTBACKS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND]

may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to offer for the RECORD a resolution adopted January 19 by the Honorable Board of Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Manchester, N.H., in which the city formally registers its protest against the arbitrary cutback ordered by the Veterans' Administration for its regional office in Manchester. The resolution speaks for itself. It represents another in the growing list of protests rising all over the country against the VA's abrupt decision. It provides an additional reason why Congress should investigate the entire decision promptly and why the VA decision should be delayed until a congressional investigation is completed. I have introduced legislation calling for such a delay and hope it will be considered in the near future.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE CLOSING OF THE REGIONAL VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OFFICE LOCATED IN THE CITY OF MANCHESTER, N.H.

Whereas the U.S. Government has ordered the discontinuance of the regional Veterans' Administration office located in this city, effective June 30, 1965; and

Whereas this agency was first established in this city in the year 1920 under the title of U.S. Veterans Bureau, while in the year 1924 the title was changed to the regional Veterans' Administration office, and since that date it has faithfully and conscientiously administered to the needs of 87,000 veterans and their families located in the State of New Hampshire, besides providing for the needs of 133 patients hospitalized at the veterans hospital in this city, also to 200 patients hospitalized at the New Hampshire State Hospital, and further assisting veterans in securing more than \$2 million under the GI veterans home mortgage loan program; and

Whereas all veterans organizations and their members located in the State of New Hampshire, besides numerous nonveterans, are conscientiously and vigorously protesting the closing of the regional Veterans' Administration office in Manchester, as proposed, feeling that it will create untold hardship and great inconvenience to the American war veterans and their families who reside in the State of New Hampshire: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the board of mayor and aldermen concur wholeheartedly with the protests being registered by the veterans residing in Manchester, also those veterans residing in the State of New Hampshire, as it will create hardship and inconvenience to all veterans in New Hampshire, besides affecting the economy of this city, as 55 employees, residents of this city and now employed in this administration, will be removed from the total yearly earnings of citizens of this city; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all members of the New Hampshire delegation in Washington, D.C., accompanied by a copy of a communication as received by this board from the Disabled American Veterans, Department of New Hampshire, Inc., and to urge them to do all possible to have the order closing the regional office of the Veterans' Administration, located in this city, reconsidered and rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution shall take effect upon its passage.

ROLAND S. VALLEE,
Mayor.

Attest.

M. J. BENSON,
City Clerk.

CLEVELAND BILL WOULD DELAY VA CLOSINGS PENDING CONGRESSIONAL STUDY

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution calling upon the President to order a delay in the proposed closings and cutbacks in the operations of the Veterans' Administration until Congress has completed its investigation.

This resolution merely asks the President to delay the changes until Congress has thoroughly investigated the matter. The VA decision, which includes plans to reduce the regional offices at Manchester and White River Junction and transfer their main functions to Boston, was taken without any prior consultation with Congress. While there is no legal requirement that this be done, it would have been prudent because Congress must approve all appropriations for the VA and is deeply concerned that needed services to veterans are not curtailed.

So far, none of the information provided by the VA is clear as to the savings these moves would make. Overall savings of \$23,500,000 are claimed, but I have been unable to obtain precise figures for Manchester and White River. The nationwide total is minute when contrasted with the \$100 billion Federal budget. The total is also small when measured against the VA's announced spending plans—some \$113 million for new hospitals in the next few years. Economy, then, does not seem to be the main reason.

The VA claims, but so far has not demonstrated, that these moves would increase its efficiency. The question remains whether these purported gains in efficiency will not be offset by reduced personal service and increased centralization of the VA. Such a result would be a serious mistake.

The increasing trend to concentrate Government services in large cities, remote from the people they are intended to serve, should be resisted except for the most compelling reasons. Modern communications are so swift that it is hard to see how merely concentrating large numbers of employees in a few big-city administrative centers, achieves any real savings. For one thing, the cost of office space is higher in the cities.

The VA's plans for Manchester and White River Junction reveal no savings or improvements in efficiency to justify the disruptions involved both for the

employees and for the veterans they serve.

I shall raise these points before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and urge the committee to demand complete answers.

INCREASES DUE TO WHEAT-COTTON PROPOSALS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the cotton program enacted in 1964 was heralded as one which would bring down prices to consumers, and those supporting the wheat certificate program which was paired with the cotton proposal denied that it would result in increased prices for consumers for flour and flour products.

It therefore came as a shock to read the official publication of the U.S. Department of Agriculture entitled "Agricultural Prices" dated January 29, 1965. The prices being paid by consumers—including farmers of course—has jumped in the past year for such items as flour, bread, cotton work shirts, sport shirts and union suits.

Here are the comparative prices as reported by USDA as of December 15, 1963 and 1964:

Item:

25-pound bag of flour-----	\$2.18	\$2.27
1-pound loaf of white bread-----	.206	.21
Cotton work shirt-----	2.33	2.37
Long-sleeved sport shirt-----	3.38	3.41
Heavy cotton union suit-----	3.07	3.14

BILL TO REPEAL COMMUNICATIONS TAX

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there is every indication that there will be repeal of many of the excise taxes imposed during World War II as emergency methods of raising revenue. The Byrnes motion would have accomplished this last summer, of course, had not the majority party defeated it in a party-line rollcall vote of 185 to 207 on June 17.

It is good to know that the administration has come around to our party's point of view on this issue and now endorses repeal of these taxes. Twenty years is a long emergency for temporary taxing purposes. We welcome the leadership's promise that in this Congress it will agree to elimination of retail excise taxes on jewelry, luggage, handbags, cosmetics, perfumes, and furs.

A number of House Members, however, on both sides of the aisle, also agree that another World War II "temporary, emergency" excise tax should be included with the so-called luxury items. This is the communications excise tax, which every household feels acutely when the time arrives each month to pay telephone and telegraph charges.

The telephone is the only household utility subject to excise taxation, and, while the tax brings in \$1 billion annually in revenue, this could be more than compensated for by the exercise of wise economies in Government spending.

Therefore, I am joining a dozen other Members of the House in introducing a bill to repeal the communications tax, in the hope that this legislation will be adopted as an amendment to the general excise tax legislation by the Ways and Means Committee.

A LETTER OF CONSCIENCE

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as a Christian and an American I am opposed to persecution of any human beings. As human beings we will have our differences of political views; we will practice different faiths; we will differ in our choices of vocations, friendships and associations. In all of these differences, however, we should be able to practice tolerance in allowing the other person his full freedom of conscience.

In my military service I visited the concentration camps of the Nazis. Prior to coming to Congress I traveled to Russia and saw firsthand the Communist persecution of those of Jewish faith. I abhor persecution in any form and believe the great need in our Nation and in the world is to recognize persecution and eliminate it wherever and whenever possible.

Today I received a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Jack Drew, secretary of the Hugo H. Hecht Lodge No. 734 of the B'nai B'rith, which I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House. Mr. Drew aptly titles his letter a "Letter of Conscience." I include it here as a part of these remarks.

The Honorable JAMES D. MARTIN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: This communication can best be categorized as a "Letter of Conscience." As Americans of Jewish faith, we are profoundly disturbed by authoritative reports of discriminatory and repressive treatment of our Jewish brethren in the Soviet Union. To our best knowledge, the reports incorporate in part the following anti-Semitic actions, now in full force, which are being taken by the Soviet Union against Soviet Jewry.

1. The suppression of the full measure of equality to the Jews in the Soviet Union, to which they are entitled under the Soviet Constitution.

2. The denial of unrestricted worship and religious instruction for young and old of the Jewish faith.

3. The denial of formal and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad, including official exchange visits and religious pilgrimages to the Holy Land.

4. The denial of the right to reopen Jewish cultural institutions and being permitted the full experience of Jewish cultural life.

5. The promulgation of anti-Semitic actions by Soviet Russian authorities; making Jews the scapegoat in the governmental campaign against economic crimes in the Soviet Union.

As American citizens of the Judeo-Christian heritage, the essential dignity and equality of all men is an elementary religious and moral principle. We further affirm that this principle is not only incorporated into the American way of life, but its application is universal in scope, as far as justice and brotherhood are concerned.

Accordingly, it is our contention that so long as this principle is violated anywhere in modern civilization, we cannot in good conscience remain silent. We, therefore, join with other Americans of all faiths and races in solemnly appealing to the good offices of our legislators and leaders of government in Washington to help alleviate the repressive conditions in Soviet Jewry.

Surely the impact of world opinion and the searching spotlight of public exposure can eventuate a change in the present posture of the Soviet Union toward the millions of Jewish Soviet citizens, whose only guilt is that they are faithful to the religion of their fathers.

We would be grateful for any salutary recourse obtained through your good offices in Congress toward furthering aid and succor to these victims of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

Respectfully yours,

JACK DREW,

Secretary, Hugh H. Hecht Lodge No. 734.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution to permit individual States of our Union to apportion the membership of one house of their legislatures on factors other than population.

I have long been hesitant to introduce legislation that would interfere with decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, but on occasion it seems imperative that we do so. On June 14, 1964, the Supreme Court decided that the sovereign States of the Union do not have the authority or the right to apportion one house of their legislatures on the basis of factors other than population alone. Not only do I believe that the decision was wrong, but I believe the sensitive balance between State and Federal powers will be irreparably damaged if the Constitution is not amended to reverse this decision.

The controversy revolves around the Court's interpretation of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution. History reveals that from its inception, the 14th amendment

was never intended to prevent a State from choosing any legislative structure it believed best suited to its needs. In fact, during the debate on the amendment in the House, it was concisely stated that the amendment "takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it." The policy of apportioning one body of a State legislature on factors other than population long preceded the enactment of the 14th amendment. And when the people of the States agreed to form a Union, it was agreed that the political rights of the States should be preserved under the Federal Constitution.

There are now 50 States in our Union, each with separate characteristics, a wide range of local considerations within each involving unique history, geography, topography, climate, distribution of population, political heritage, and individual citizen's economic, political and social interests. I would agree with the Supreme Court that legislators represent people, not trees or acres. But we must also realize that people are not mere numbers and must be considered for their needs.

The majority certainly must have effective rule, and they do. But the minority, too, is entitled to effective representation lest important segments of our people be completely subjected to the will of a temporary majority. To abandon this concept would be to convert the oldest constitutional government in the world to something potentially dangerous to individual liberty.

For these reasons, I have introduced a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States so that States may apportion one house of their legislature on the basis of factors other than population.

THE CRIME OF PRESIDENTIAL ASSASSINATION

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would make it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President or Vice President, or anyone in line for the Presidency, including the President-elect and Vice-President-elect.

It was certainly shocking to learn 14 months ago that there was no Federal statute that made it a crime to assassinate the President. Over a year has passed since that tragic day in Dallas when a stunned and mourning Nation watched local authorities, whether rightly or wrongly, handle a case that was obviously one for Federal jurisdiction. It was astounding to learn that the FBI had to wait until local authorities invited them into the case.

Attacks upon a number of lesser Federal officials are covered by the United States Code, but not the men with which the American people have entrusted their

future. This bill would eliminate any repetition of those unbelievable circumstances of November 1963.

This bill follows the recommendations of the Warren Commission to make it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President, the Vice President, any other officer next in line of succession to the President, the President-elect, and the Vice-President-elect. I sincerely urge the Congress to approve this proposal at the earliest possible moment.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE FRANK J. BECKER

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the close of the 88th Congress, I have wanted to take the floor and state my regret that my good friend Frank J. Becker will no longer serve beside me—and guide me—in the 89th Congress.

He was in many ways a man of contradictions—humble and proud, hard-headed, and soft-hearted, unyielding and yet warm.

Frank liked to give; and he gave to me and his fellow man a friendship, love, and dedication that is seldom to be seen and experienced on this earth.

Frank was a man among men; but a conscious child of God. It was fitting that he should choose to retire from Congress and work in the months after his decision with the same intense devotion which marked his career during the last 12 years.

If a Representative is to be worth anything he must be honest, independent, and fiercely determined to do what is right. Frank was worth his salt.

When he retired, the Congress lost its last "angry Congressman." His most ardent opponents will miss him. The Congress is something less without him.

His last act as a Congressman was typically a letter to his constituents. It reveals the man we all knew and something of the man we could only guess at.

I wish to spread it in the RECORD for posterity, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(From your Congressman Frank J. Becker, Fifth District New York, December 16, 1964)

DEAR FRIEND: As we approach the end of another year, I'm writing you from Washington as if it were yesterday. It was President Eisenhower's first inauguration with all of the pomp and ceremony that is official Washington on such occasions.

This task is filled with memories and a touch of nostalgia. While my decision not to seek reelection was announced last January, the full impact of closing my career is just setting in.

I cannot pick up a file, walk down a House corridor or look out across the Capitol from my office, without the events of the past 12 years rushing back at me.

I can still remember my first introduction to Washington as if it were yesterday. It was President Eisenhower's first inauguration with all of the pomp and ceremony that is official Washington on such occasions.

This first official visit was marked by the assignment of my congressional office, the office I was to occupy for the next 12 years.

I think the thing that impressed me most about this first experience in Washington was the fact that only in America could a man of my humble origin be elected to the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Yet, here I was, one of 531 men, serving in the Legislature of the greatest Nation in the world. Subsequent decisions I was to participate in would not only touch the lives of 180 million Americans but, in reality, would affect the lives of over 2 billion people; since what is done in America must ultimately have an influence on the lives of all the world's people.

What a responsibility, what a privilege, what a challenge, and I am no less impressed today as I prepare to retire as I was then at the very beginning of my tenure in office.

From these early days onward, march a series of incomparable experiences that no newsletter could adequately reveal.

On one occasion it meant crouching in a trench in the Nevada desert witnessing the awesome spectacle of a mighty atom bomb explosion. On another occasion it meant hurtling through space crashing the sound barrier in a F-104B jet fighter. On still another occasion it meant landing on an aircraft carrier in the middle of the Mediterranean Sea.

But my most unforgettable moment was the day the House of Representatives was interrupted by the staccato sound of gunfire, and my colleagues and I found ourselves the target of a group of fanatical Puerto Rican nationalists attempting to impress Congress how badly they wanted independence.

Yet, all of my memories were neither exciting nor happy. First, there was the ever-present specter of death, which continued to take the lives of one and then another Member of the Congress, many of them young men and dear friends.

Then came the great tragedy, and I found myself standing in the Capitol rotunda paying my last respects, along with a grieving nation, to our late President, John F. Kennedy.

Nevertheless, these were just moments out of 12 exciting, productive years in Washington.

From the beginning, it seems I was destined to fight my great battles over the spiritual rather than the material issues facing our Nation.

First, I introduced a resolution calling on the President of the United States to instruct our United Nations delegation to request that the General Assembly open each session with a prayer. Otherwise, I felt it would be futile to struggle for peace in an atmosphere which deliberately excluded God.

Unfortunately, this sincere gesture was blocked by our own American State Department. It was their contention that this action would offend Soviet Russia and her satellites. But then what sincere effort for peace has not offended the Communist world? Since that time, I have watched that noble, but illusive goal of peace, slip further and further from our grasp.

Next, was my long and frustrating fight to have the American flag follow our American servicemen in foreign lands.

This struggle involved my campaign against article 7 of the Status of Forces Agreement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This arrangement permitted foreign nations to prosecute American military men in their own courts. My position was that, since these were American servicemen, they were entitled to be tried in American military courts-martial where they understand the language, where the ideal of justice that "all men are innocent until proven guilty" prevails, and where hostile foreign citizenry cannot influence the outcome of the trial.

Here, once again, I crossed swords with our State Department. State argued that this abridgement of rights was necessary in order to placate the very nations that many of these same American servicemen had fought to liberate. While article 7 still stands, I did succeed in convincing our Government to make a vigorous effort to have foreign nations turn over American military personnel charged with a crime to the jurisdiction of the American military. Thus, today, the majority of all these cases are being tried in our military courts.

From these early battles to the still unfinished task of returning the right to pray to our public schools (of which you have read so much) there were many bills and many votes to contribute to a better and stronger America. Many of these votes were cast to save the taxpayers from the undue burden of spending in areas best served by the individual or the local and State government.

In making final judgment on the thousands of bills that came before me in my 12 years in Congress, I used three basic rules: Is it constitutional, is it good for my country, and can we afford it. If they passed this test, the bills received my support. If, however, they failed in any of these rules, they received my dissent.

Well, you might ask what does the box score show? How did you fare on the many crucial battles you fought on Capitol Hill? I must confess that I never kept a won and lost tally but then that really is not as important as honestly and sincerely believing you were right, and then fighting with all your might to make your point of view prevail. This I always tried to do.

Now, as I close this newsletter, I have one more journey to make and that will start with the long walk down through the subway that leads from this New House Office Building to the Capitol. There I plan to pay one last visit to the floor of the House of Representatives. It will be empty then. But for me, and, I guess, for any man who has served there, it will be filled with the voices of the men with whom he has served, as well as the voices of men reaching back to the very first Congress in 1789.

Then there will be, for me, that final rapping of the gavel and the Speaker of the House saying, "This Congress and the congressional career of the gentleman from New York stand adjourned, sine die."

And so with this last goodbye go my sincerest thanks, to you my constituents for affording me the privilege of serving you in the Congress, and to the thousands of you who worked so diligently every 2 years in my reelection campaigns. And finally, I wish to express my special thanks to the members of my Washington and Lynbrook staff for their devotion to duty and loyalty to me.

So again to you my heartfelt thanks, and now this newsletter too, stands adjourned "sine die".

With my very best wishes for you in the years ahead, I remain.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. BECKER.

THE REVEREND EDWARD J. COLES

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLODY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, it seems fitting to note, at this hour, the passing of a beloved citizen of Lake County and

of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois—the Reverend Edward J. Coles, pastor of the First Baptist Church in North Chicago for the past 29 years.

Reverend Coles is identified by all as the father of Nat King Cole, the gifted and distinguished singer and entertainer who, himself, is combating illness at this time.

Reverend Coles has attained prominence in Illinois and in the Nation in his own right. Born in Montgomery, Ala., he came to Illinois in 1922 and after his religious studies and earlier ministry he became pastor of the First Baptist Church in North Chicago in 1935.

As a citizen and spiritual leader Reverend Coles' life has epitomized the best which humankind has attained. As a friend, husband and father he was beloved and respected.

When family, friends and spiritual and public leaders gather to pay their final respects to Rev. Edward J. Coles, they will be honoring a man of faith and humility, a man of warmth and loyalty, a man of great heart and great spirit, a man whose love flowed from the Father and who was and is beloved by all.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many others in this Chamber join me in this tribute to Rev. Edward J. Coles. In the name of the House of Representatives, and in my own behalf, I extend this expression of respect and sympathy to his beloved widow, Corabell, and to his children and other members of the family.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 26, 1965, when the House voted on House Joint Resolution 234, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965 for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, it was necessary for me to be absent from the city. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to recommit which would bar the use of any funds to finance the exportation of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended. On January 11 and 12, 1965, 2 weeks before this vote was taken, I discussed this matter and my position on it as is shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE HONORABLE JIMMY QUILLEN, OF TENNESSEE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a distinct pleasure and honor to rise today to commend my colleague and fellow 88th Club Member, the Honorable

JIMMY QUILLEN, of Tennessee, on his superior vote-getting ability, in a year when, regrettably, our party suffered great losses throughout the country. In the First District of Tennessee, which JIMMY represents in this Congress, he polled more than 72 percent of the total vote cast. At any time, this would be an outstanding achievement. This is a direct tribute to the type of service which JIMMY QUILLEN instituted during his first term in the House of Representatives, his dedication to duty and his desire to do more than necessary—to "go the extra mile" in determining the problems and interests of his constituency, and to address himself to those problems and interests in a direct, forthright, and resolute manner.

It is an encouraging fact and a credit to JIMMY QUILLEN's constituency that they have recognized and returned so overwhelmingly this outstanding public servant to the Congress of the United States. I look forward to serving with JIMMY for many years to come.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in offering congratulations and our appreciation for the fine record and vote-getting ability of Representative JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN, of the First District of Tennessee.

He was the top Republican vote getter in the Nation on November 3, 1964, having received a total of 72 percent plus of the votes cast in his election.

It is fitting that we honor him in recognition of this outstanding accomplishment, of which we are all justifiably proud.

JIMMY QUILLEN won the nomination in a hard fought, five-man primary battle in 1962, then went on to win the 1962 general election by a small margin; his percentage of the votes cast was less than 55 percent.

As a freshman Member, JIMMY QUILLEN worked closely with his constituents. He inaugurated a refreshing program of "open door" meetings throughout the 14 counties in his district. More than 10,000 people took advantage of the opportunity to meet and talk with their Congressman during these sessions. Representative QUILLEN held these meetings at the county courthouses on Saturdays, visiting with a wide range of people in all walks of life.

Representative QUILLEN made many trips between Washington and Tennessee's First District. Incidentally, these trips were at his own expense. Contrary to popular belief, Members of Congress pay their own way on trips home, except for three round trips each session. His "open door" policy extended to his Washington office and perhaps none of our Members worked harder to solve the many problems that arise between the citizens and their Government—problems which the Congressman attempts to solve as a liaison between the agencies and the people.

Some 5,000 persons turned out for an appreciation dinner on May 15, 1964, a

preview of the overwhelming endorsement of the people of his district were to give him at the polls in November.

As House minority leader, I share with my colleagues our pride in the fine record compiled by a fellow Republican Member of Congress, and congratulate the fine people of his district for their wise judgment in continuing JIMMY QUILLEN's service to the Nation and to their district.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to extend my personal congratulations to our colleague, JIMMY QUILLEN, presently serving his second term in this great body as spokesman for the people of the First District of Tennessee. We congratulate him not solely on his reelection but upon his overwhelming majority—more than 72 percent of the total vote cast.

He has come to be known on our side of the aisle as the Nation's top vote-getter. The significance of his majority lies not so much in the fact that it was 72 percent, but in the fact that 2 years previous it was less than 55 percent.

This does not merely mean that JIM conducted an effective campaign in his district of 14 counties. The type of campaign he conducted does not alone, by any means, account for his huge majority. The increase of 17 percentage points as a majority realized in 1964 over that in the 1962 election is due to the high quality of representation he gave his people during the 2-year period.

I take this occasion not alone to congratulate JIM QUILLEN. I congratulate the people of the First District of Tennessee. They recognized in him what we all know from what he has done and said in the Congress: a man firm on principles in which he believes, courageous in his convictions, and determined in his desire to serve his district and our country.

The assignment of this stalwart Republican from Tennessee to the vitally important Rules Committee emphasizes his worth to our party cause and the Congress.

And we hope our colleague will remain a Member of this House for many years to come.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Republican conference.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and all my colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for his outstanding achievement in the 1964 general elections.

As the top votegetter of all Republicans in the congressional elections, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] lays claim to an enviable distinction. His 72-percent majority is a tribute to his own votegetting ability and should serve as an inspiration to all who are in politics or who would enter the political arena.

Mr. Speaker, in a year when my party's fortunes were not on the ascendancy, it is particularly gratifying to take note of the singular achievement of the gentleman from Tennessee. I wish to personally and publicly offer to him my congratulations and best wishes for continued success in the years ahead.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, the colleague of our friend Congressman QUILLEN.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride and pleasure in joining with my fellow colleagues to pay a special tribute to JAMES H. QUILLEN.

A great writer once said:

Serve and thou shalt be served. If you love and serve men, you cannot, by any hiding, escape the remuneration.

The meaning of these words best explains why Congressman QUILLEN stands above the rest here today, receiving this deserved recognition.

I have known Representative QUILLEN for the past 15 years. I have never had the pleasure of meeting a finer gentleman nor a more dedicated and devoted public servant.

When elected to the 88th Congress, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] engaged in a very hard-fought campaign—winning the nomination by only a small majority. During the following 2 years, with enthusiastic determination, Congressman QUILLEN traveled around his district promoting republicanism—seeking recruits and encouraging unity for the cause to which we are all dedicated. The results of this endeavor are self-evident.

Representative QUILLEN, in attempting to provide representation by and for the people of his district, actively solicited the counsel and advice of his constituents—providing them an opportunity of participating in governmental affairs. Much of his success can be attributed to his earnest desire to serve the people in a manner they respect.

This special recognition which we are bestowing upon our colleague for achieving the distinction of being the top Republican votegetter, is not only a tribute to him, but to every citizen of the First Congressional District of Tennessee. In their efforts to elect a dedicated, devoted, and experienced public servant, they have sent to Congress a man whom we have all come to admire and respect—a colleague most deserving of this honor.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID].

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in the House this afternoon in honoring a fellow member of our 88th Republican Club, the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. QUILLEN.

Many of you here today will recall that our 88th Club last year designated JIMMY as our "Congressman of the Week." We did not so honor him merely because we liked his ready smile, his pleasant personality, or his gentlemanly

ways. When a group of colleagues select a "Congressman of the Week," they are in effect choosing a "Congressman's Congressman." This means that he must be outstanding.

JIMMY QUILLEN is outstanding. Just take a look at his plurality in the last general election on November 3. Seventy-two percent of his good constituents from the First District of Tennessee voted for him, making him the top Republican votegetter of the year. The people of his district have long been accustomed to the able representation of JIMMY's predecessor, the late Congressman Carroll Reece, who is still fondly remembered and admired by many in this chamber. So JIMMY had big shoes to fill and high standards to meet. His reelection was a resounding vote of approval.

I know I speak for all of you here when I congratulate JIMMY on his fine record and his many accomplishments in the Congress. His district may well be proud of him. And I am sure you also join with me in wishing him the best for the future.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I arise to honor my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] who happens to be my neighbor from over the mountain. I know him to be honest, honorable, humble, and intelligent. The greatness of his victory was attained in the face of a Democratic tornado. He faced on the political arena every form of man or beast the well-financed opposition party could furnish and never lowered his arm. We freshmen would do well to call him chief and sit at his feet as did Saul of Tarsus at the feet of Gamaliel the tentmaker, humbly gleaning his words of political wisdom.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to JIMMY QUILLEN. It was my privilege during the period of his first campaign to visit him and make an address in his community. At that time I was impressed with his potentials as a future Congressman. What he has delivered here has been wholly up to my expectations. As it has turned out, indeed, he has been a very worthy successor of Carroll Reece, who so ably and in such a distinguished fashion represented his district for many years. I trust he will not only enjoy many years of success in the Congress, but I wish for him and his lovely wife many years of happiness.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pleasure that I join today in honoring a close friend and an esteemed colleague. Con-

gressman JIMMY QUILLEN of the First District of Tennessee represents an area of the beautiful Appalachian region which borders upon North Carolina's Ninth District which I have the privilege to represent here. Our two districts share many of the same problems. The fine people of this scenic area also share the strength, independence, and personal resources that are so notable among those who love and have developed mountain regions.

I am happy to say that the work and dedication to principle of JIMMY QUILLEN are well known in North Carolina. Certainly, that respect for our neighboring Congressman is well earned. Those of us who know him and the work he is performing for those he represents and for the country hold a special regard for him. We are especially proud that the people of the First District have returned him to Congress by such an overwhelming vote. It is a special tribute to JIMMY QUILLEN that he has received 72 percent of the votes cast in his election contest in 1964.

This tremendous vote of confidence is no accident. It represents a recognition of the tireless efforts JIMMY QUILLEN has expended in the service of his district. There can be no doubt that this dedicated "mountain man" has performed his great responsibilities superbly, never forgetting the people and problems of his area at the same time he pursues the highest principles in his service to the Nation.

To me, the ideals of public service include a sincere and deeply held desire to work in behalf of the best interests of the people, rather than for personal advancement or narrow partisan advantage. This motivation, combined with high intelligence and unswerving integrity, are essential for those who seek and hold high public office. In JIMMY QUILLEN, we see these attributes strikingly combined.

All of us here today join in expressing our affection and good wishes to JIMMY and his lovely wife, Cecile. We know that as the years pass, the First District of Tennessee will have cause for great pride in the record of service which their fine Congressman will render as their spokesman on the national scene.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that each of us in this body today has known what it is to bask in the beautiful sunlight of an election victory. It is something to salute a gentleman for that kind of an accomplishment; but I think that the greatest single tribute that has been paid to the gentleman from Tennessee is the recognition that has been given to him by his colleagues in this House. I was pleased and honored to be nominated by the gentleman who now has the floor, the gentleman from Illinois, to represent the Republican Members elected to the 88th Congress on the executive committee of the committee on committees as one of its 12 members. That committee has the responsibility of recommending committee assignments to the Speaker. It was

my privilege to place in nomination the name of JAMES QUILLEN as a member of the Committee on Rules. The executive committee is pledged to secrecy on its deliberations and actions, but I think I would not be violating my trust to say to the Members of this body that the name of JAMES QUILLEN as a member of the Committee on Rules was received with universal approbation.

There were a great many voices raised at that time in support of his great ability, in support of his character, in support of his worthiness to serve on what is perhaps the most distinguished committee in the House.

So I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, and honored to join my colleagues in saluting JIMMY QUILLEN. I look forward to his service on that committee and in this body to be one of distinction for a good many years.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to participate in this tribute to my colleague, JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN, Member of Congress from the First District of Tennessee.

From my personal observation of Congressman QUILLEN and his work, it is not too difficult for me to understand why his district supported him so overwhelmingly in the last general election. It was with respectful admiration that I noted that JIMMY QUILLEN received the highest percentage of Republican votes of any Republican Member elected to the 89th Congress.

The enthusiasm with which Congressman JAMES H. QUILLEN entered upon his congressional duties, the willingness with which he undertook to extend his knowledge of our great Federal Government and the details of the issues which confront the Nation today are among the reasons for the national recognition which has come to him for his service in the House.

I congratulate Congressman QUILLEN on these merited honors and extend my good wishes to his family and the fortunate residents of the First District of Tennessee whom he so ably represents.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues in paying honor to JIMMY QUILLEN, of Tennessee, on this occasion. I feel the greatest honor any of us can be paid is to have the confidence of the people that one represents.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the events of the past year have demonstrated that the constituents of our colleague JIMMY QUILLEN have that sort of confidence in him. I have known JIMMY since I have been a Member of Congress and I have been very impressed with his legislative ability, his dedication to his constituents and colleagues, and his significant contributions to Tennessee's First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, JIMMY QUILLEN has not only represented his district with great honor and great ability but he has also contributed greatly to the betterment of our Nation.

So, I take a great deal of pleasure and honor in participating on this occasion in paying tribute to one of our colleagues who certainly deserves it.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in this tribute to an outstanding Member of this great body. Many words of praise have and will be said about the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN, for his service to the Congress and his representation for all of the people of the First District of Tennessee. To me, the people of the First District of Tennessee have said it all—forcefully, dramatically, and ever so rightly—in returning JIM to Congress as the leading Republican vote-getter among all our party's candidates for Congress. He engineered his own landslide, capturing over 72 percent of the congressional vote. That is a real testimonial—far exceeding any words of praise.

As one who served with JIM QUILLEN on the House Committee on Public Works, I have had the opportunity to admire and respect his fine contributions to our Nation and his district. It was, and still is, apparent he came to serve and to work. And, he came prepared. Prior to running for Congress in 1962, he served 8 years as a Republican member of the Tennessee House of Representatives and served as minority leader for two terms.

In a relatively short time in Congress, JIM QUILLEN has made his mark, and it is obvious that he is going to serve here for a good number of years. For this, everyone can be thankful. My sincere congratulations to the top votegetter, and many, many more of the same in the years ahead.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the many friends of the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. QUILLEN, in calling attention to the contribution he has made since coming to the Congress in 1962. JIMMY has made his mark on the legislative history of the 88th Congress. The election statistics attest to his effectiveness as a campaigner. We who have worked with him here in the House are happy that the people of the First District of Tennessee, whom he has served with distinction, also recognize his outstanding ability. The proof of this is the resounding majority with which they returned him.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the special order commending the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN, for his achievement in being the "outstanding votegetter" of the Republican Party for the entire United States in the 1964 general election.

While this is indeed complimentary to JIMMY QUILLEN, as an individual, we should further recognize the wise decision and independent thinking of the people of his congressional district in the great State of Tennessee.

This is important because it shows sound leadership in a State and a region of the country that has been traditionally dedicated to the principles of the party of Jefferson, and has provided the people of his congressional district an opportunity to express themselves at the polls on behalf of these same principles, even though they are associated now with the party of Lincoln.

It would appear that JIMMY QUILLEN has in effect become a catalyst around which many people can rally in support of their deep-seated philosophical convictions. Throughout this great Nation we hear from many outstanding people formerly associated with the Democratic Party, who find it increasingly difficult to remain with the party of Jefferson because of the tendency of the Democratic leadership to move away from the proven principles and concepts of government initiated by Thomas Jefferson. There are many of us who feel there is little or no difference between the teachings of Jefferson and Lincoln.

It would appear that the high vote of confidence given JIMMY QUILLEN is an indication of a trend among the people of Tennessee and other Southern States. I would expect this trend toward a stronger two-party system in the South to expand to the benefit of this Nation and potentially to the entire free world. His record is symbolic of the trend of people who are desirous of retaining the concept attributed to Thomas Jefferson: "That government which governs least, governs best." These same people are now seeking comfort that can only be provided in the Republican Party where more dynamic leadership in the State and local units of government is advocated as opposed to an overbearing, dominating central government.

We congratulate JIMMY QUILLEN for his great victory. We are proud to have him carry the Republican banner. We recognize him as a leader in the political transition of the great States of the South. Inwardly I am sure he is applauding this great transition. Outwardly the nations of the free world are depending upon expansion of this trend.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join my fellow Republicans in paying tribute to the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN—an outstanding votegetter and an outstanding Congressman. JIMMY led all Republican congressional candidates for 1964 with a plurality of over 72 percent. This magnificent showing was by no means an accident. Since he was first elected to Congress in 1962, JIMMY has set an outstanding example of leadership and service to his district and his country—a fact recognized not only by his constituents in the First Congressional District of Tennessee, but also by his Republican colleagues, who named him "Congressman of the Week" in 1964.

Congressman QUILLEN distinguished himself during his first term in the House by amending the administration's Federal Aid Highway Act, in selection for membership on the Republican House committee on committees, and in membership on the Public Works Committee

and Subcommittee on Roads, Rivers, and Harbors. His highly successful open door policy serves as a model of distinguished service to constituents.

I am sure that Jimmy's excellent record, plus this thoughtful attention to his district were the factors that led to his magnificent plurality. May all of us strive to emulate his example.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join my colleagues today in congratulating our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN, for being the top votegetter among all Republican candidates for Congress throughout the United States in the 1964 general election.

Receiving over 72 percent of the vote is an outstanding accomplishment and a tribute to the record JIMMY QUILLEN has built during his first 2 years in this body.

As the ranking Republican on the Public Works Committee on which he served, I feel particularly well qualified to speak of the devotion JIM has to his job and the ability he possesses in carrying it out. In fact, it was his perspicacity as a member of the Roads Subcommittee which led to his introduction of a successful amendment to the Federal Highway Act to guarantee that future sections of the Interstate Highway System shall be constructed to adequately accommodate traffic for at least 20 years from the time of construction.

In fact, so significant was this amendment, that his colleagues in the 88th Club recognized him as "Congressman of the Week" last fall. He was also presented with a well-deserved citation in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the Roads Subcommittee.

I might add that as the ranking minority member of the full Public Works Committee this session, I will continue to seek JIMMY QUILLEN's sound advice on highway matters although he no longer serves on this committee.

The Congress of the United States is fortunate in having the services of JIMMY QUILLEN as are the people of the First District of Tennessee who can look with pride and satisfaction to their Representative in the Congress.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in this tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN. Congressman QUILLEN has distinguished himself as an able, sincere, and hard-working Member of the House of Representatives.

I recall his constructive contributions to the Federal-Aid Highway Act during the 88th Congress. Like many of us, he has a record of service in the legislature of his State upon which he built a foundation for his service in Congress. When the highway legislation was before us a year ago, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], drew upon his State experience with the highway legislative committee in Tennessee, and he successfully sponsored an amendment to guarantee that our Interstate Highway System will not be obsolete 20 years from the time of construction.

He takes his responsibilities to his constituency seriously, and he obviously has

won the respect and confidence of the people of the First District of Tennessee. Congressman QUILLEN has formed a partnership with the citizens of his district. He has openly sought their opinions through questionnaires. He has made it his business to know their problems by a program of visitation into each of the counties in his district.

JIMMY QUILLEN has set an outstanding example of the meaning of representative government. He is a credit to his district, his State, and our Nation.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN, received a tremendous vote of confidence from his constituents in the First District of Tennessee in November. Defeating his opponent in 1962 with less than 55 percent of the vote cast, in 1964, he swamped his opponent with more than 72 percent of the total vote.

His vote-getting ability can be traced directly to his concern for all the people in his district. During the 88th Congress, JIMMY visited each county on a regularly scheduled basis, personally interviewing over 10,000 constituents during his 14-county tour. Eastern Tennesseans are fortunate in having a man represent them who cares about their problems and who is desirous of finding ways to work out solutions.

I am pleased to add my applause to my friend JIMMY QUILLEN as he is saluted by his colleagues as Congressman of the Week.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN, has earned a reputation for effective leadership through a very essential ingredient—hard work.

His ability to get things done was recognized long ago in the Tennessee Legislature, and in 1962 the citizens of the First Congressional District wisely sent this able legislator to Congress.

Through his dedicated service to the people he represents, JIMMY is becoming known as Mr. Republican, a cherished title bestowed upon his predecessor, the late B. Carroll Reece who served here in the House of Representatives for 35 years.

That he is deserving of the title, Mr. Republican, there can be no doubt. Last November 3 the people of his district showed their faith in JIMMY and their recognition of his ability. They sent him back to Washington as their Representative by the largest vote margin among all Republican candidates for Congress this year—72 percent, a truly amazing victory.

To my hard working colleague, I say congratulations on a job well done.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in pointing out to the House the outstanding home district acceptance of our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN.

Members of Congress, regardless of which side of the aisle they sit on, know what an outstanding Member JIMMY QUILLEN is, but it is also interesting to note that his qualities for hard work, straight thinking, and sincerity of purpose that have gained him so many friends in the House are undoubtedly the

same qualities that resulted in his having received the highest percentage of votes of any Republican candidate for Congress this year.

Being a Congressman, while a public service, is a personal thing, a very personal relationship between the people of your district, whose votes you are actually casting, and yourself. And the finest tribute that can be accorded a Member is that those folks back home personally think he is doing a fine job.

There is no better way of demonstrating this than to come up with a fine, solid vote such as JIMMY received. It certainly testifies to the fact that the qualities that are uniquely JIMMY's are appreciated in his home district in Tennessee.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and pleased to join my colleagues in a much deserved tribute to a good friend, a distinguished legislator, and a great American, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN.

In 2 short years, Congressman QUILLEN has demonstrated a knowledge and grasp of the problems of government and the legislative process which has made him the envy of his peers and has brought him unprecedented recognition by the leadership in his committee assignments.

The people of his district, and indeed, the State of Tennessee, can be proud; that they are blessed with a Representative who makes democracy a reality; and for the good of the country, I pray he will have many, many years of service in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I know that I join all of my Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives when I commend the gentleman from Tennessee Congressman JAMES H. QUILLEN for his performance in the 1964 general election. It is with great pleasure that I take advantage of the opportunity provided by special order to honor Congressman QUILLEN for his performance as the top votegetter in the election. His was a performance that should serve as a goal for all Republicans.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege to join today in the many well-deserved tributes being paid to the gentleman from the First District of Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLEN.

When JIMMY QUILLEN was elected in 1962 to the U.S. House of Representatives he stepped into a vacancy created by the death of Tennessee's longtime great Republican leader, Representative Carroll Reece and the retirement from the House of his equally respected widow, Mrs. Louise Reece. The Reece fame for service is widely recognized and made big shoes for JIMMY QUILLEN to fill. But I am happy to say he measures well against such exacting standards.

During those first 2 years in Congress, JIMMY QUILLEN was not content to sit in Washington with but casual contact with his beloved First District. Instead, he conducted a regular series of "open doors" where our colleague personally talked over problems with his constituents and permitted the citizens to par-

ticipate in their government. Carrying this concept further, he mailed out a successful questionnaire seeking the views of his constituents on major legislation.

As evidence of his interest in the affairs of his State, JIMMY QUILLEN was elected in 1954 to the Tennessee House of Representatives and served in that capacity for 8 years. His colleagues there chose him their minority leader and he was twice nominated for the speakership of the State house.

As evidence of his personal popularity, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents in his district reelected JIMMY QUILLEN in 1964 to a second term in the House by over 72 percent of the vote, making him the top Republican votegetter in all of Congress.

As evidence of his abilities in the House of Representatives he has now been selected to serve on the important Rules Committee. Assigning a sophomore Representative to this influential group is without recent precedent and is further testimonial of the legislative talents and energy of the gentleman from the First District.

I know that JIMMY's charming wife, Cecile, has been a constant inspiration to him.

As a Congressman, I am honored to sit with JIMMY QUILLEN in the House.

As an elected official, I am delighted JIMMY QUILLEN is a Republican.

As a Tennessean, I am fortunate to call him neighbor.

And as a man, I am proud to list JIMMY QUILLEN as a close friend.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, Tennessee may well be proud of its Representative in the U.S. Congress from the First District. JIMMY QUILLEN has demonstrated outstanding capabilities as a legislator and I join in properly saluting him today—this very special day designated by his colleagues to publicly acknowledge JIMMY's accomplishments.

We who have served with him in Congress applaud JIMMY's initiative and drive, his quick grasp and thorough analysis of major legislative measures, as well as his great devotion to country.

Recognition of JIMMY's activities came early in his first year as a freshman Congressman when he was named Congressman of the Week for his outstanding contribution in the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee. This signal recognition was accorded by his colleagues of the 88th Club, where I have served with JIMMY for the past 2 years. The competition for such designation is keen and his selection was a true indication of leadership and respect.

An assignment to the much sought after and vital House Committee on Committees followed, further indication of the trust placed in JIMMY by his colleagues, as an assignment of this kind is rarely given to a freshman Congressman.

JIMMY's activities on the homefront are in the true tradition of the U.S. Constitution. Not only does he keep his constituents well informed on the happenings in Washington through regular news releases; but he also seeks their views on the major issues through legislative questionnaires. It is obvious that JIMMY's interest in his constituents is

paramount. He believes this to be the only efficient and effective way to represent them. They are indeed well represented.

It is obvious also that JIMMY is loved and respected, and this is the greatest tribute any man in public life may hope to achieve. The mandate of the electorate is clear as JIMMY has been recognized as the top GOP votegetter in the Nation, having polled a greater percentage of votes than any other congressional candidate. This is truly a great tribute to a great man.

We salute you JIMMY, wishing you continuing success, and commend the residents of the First Congressional District of Tennessee on their enthusiastic selection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join today in this tribute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, JIMMY QUILLLEN. In the relatively short time he has been with us, he has made himself one of the most valuable Members of this body, and he has a bright future ahead in the Congress. The remarkable vote he received in the election is evidence that the people of his district recognize his abilities and achievements. I congratulate JIMMY QUILLLEN, and I congratulate the people of his district for the kind of representation and leadership he is giving to them and to the Nation.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time extend my congratulations to one of our Republican Members who I believe has done an outstanding job, and who won the overwhelming endorsement of the people of his district during the past election.

Tennessee's First District Congressman, JAMES H. QUILLLEN, better known to all of us and most people in his district as JIMMY was the top votegetter of our Republican Party throughout the country last fall. He received 72 percent of the vote in his district, which is a testimony to his good work as a freshman Congressman during the 88th Congress. It also shows mighty good judgment on the part of the constituents of the First District.

JIMMY QUILLLEN has certainly earned the acclaim of his district. As a freshman Congressman he established a unique record. Few freshmen ever amend a major bill, yet Representative QUILLLEN spotted a flaw in the Nation's highway legislation, introduced and saw through to passage a corrective amendment which will protect the standards of our Interstate Highway System for 20 years after the date of construction.

He guided through Congress two measures which benefited the Andrew Johnson Memorial at Greeneville, Tenn. Three pieces of law in a freshman session is an unusual record. It is a tribute to both JIMMY QUILLLEN's sagacity and tenacity. His attendance record was outstanding, and indicated clearly that JIMMY was on the job, doing the legislative chores his constituents sent him to Washington to perform.

I am certain that all my Republican colleagues join me in congratulating

JIMMY QUILLLEN on his measure of appreciation by the folks back home, and I know that those on the other side of the aisle have come to respect him as a dedicated and able legislator.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to join the distinguished Members of the Republican 88th Club in honoring our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLLEN. His achievement as the top votegetter among all Republican candidates for Congress in the 1964 general election is indeed a tribute to him and to the entire party.

Certainly it is a tribute to the good taste and discrimination of the people of Tennessee's First District that they returned JIMMY QUILLLEN to Congress with an overwhelming majority. Doubtless they are well aware of his untiring efforts in their behalf.

I greatly enjoy my association with JIMMY in the House of Representatives. He is a most able and diligent Member of this Congress. I hope he will continue to serve in Congress for many years to come.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to pay my respects to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLLEN]. We have served on the Public Works Committee together and I know firsthand how conscientious and hard working he is. The people of his district are to be congratulated in sending him back to Congress. I salute the gentleman on his tremendous victory at the polls and look forward to many more years of working with him in Congress.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and a privilege to participate in this recognition of the election achievement of the honorable gentleman from the First District of the State of Tennessee, Congressman JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLLEN.

Achieving a majority of votes, as we Republicans have come to find out, is a difficult and trying task. Nonetheless, the gentleman from Tennessee has persevered. He has in fact succeeded in achieving a tremendous vote plurality in 1964 which no other Republican Member of this House has equaled. We must attribute Congressman QUILLLEN's amazing election success to the wisdom of his constituents, to the diligence of his campaign, and to the quality of his service. It would be well for many of us to thoroughly examine Congressman QUILLLEN's techniques in the hope of gleaning some insight into his outstanding achievement.

I hail the gentleman from Tennessee, and I look forward to his improving his performance in 1966—if possible.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and service of Representative QUILLLEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION TO DELAY PLANS TO CONSOLIDATE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REGIONAL OFFICES AND TO CLOSE 15 VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution calling on the President to delay announced plans to consolidate 17 Veterans' Administration regional offices and close 15 Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliary homes until the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is given an opportunity to look into this matter.

I believe enough questions have been raised with respect to the closing order that we are entitled to a full explanation and justification of this plan. In my opinion it has not been proved that the stated objectives of economy and better service to veterans will be met by this proposal.

I have been notified by the Veterans' Administration that the Cincinnati regional office will be consolidated with the Cleveland office. It is my understanding that this will mean a loss of 280 jobs in the Cincinnati area and that these employees will be offered employment in the Cleveland office. Apparently, then, there will be no savings as far as salaries are concerned.

But, more important, I am concerned about the welfare of our veterans and their families. I am not convinced that their best interests will be served by this move or by the other proposals made in the recent VA order. Their interests should be of paramount importance, and I sincerely believe that in the Cincinnati case especially their best interests would be served by the office remaining in Cincinnati.

THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate passed the International Coffee Agreement bill by an overwhelming vote of 56 to 23. This bill, S. 701, is the implementing legislation for the International Coffee Agreement. The agreement was ratified by the Senate in 1963 and since that time we have been a member of the International Coffee Organization. The purpose of the implementing bill is to permit the United

States to carry out its responsibilities as a member.

In acting swiftly, in the first few weeks of the new Congress, the Senate has done much to correct the impression that was left at the close of the 88th Congress when the work of passing the implementing legislation was left undone. To say that the image of Uncle Sam, reaching across the borders of Latin America in order to help the peoples of those Latin American countries help themselves, faded somewhat when we failed to complete our commitment to the stabilization of the coffee industry, is putting it mildly. On January 12, 1965, the Ambassador of Costa Rica, Gonzalo J. Facio, touched on this subject in a speech he delivered at Yankton College in South Dakota. He said:

The failure of the House of Representatives to pass the enabling legislation during the past session was received with bewilderment—and in some cases bitter criticism—of the United States by the Latin American press. This negative action also caused much embarrassment to the U.S. delegation to the Third Meeting of Ministers of Economy of the Americas, held in Lima, Peru, last December.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about pan-American friendship and inter-American friendship for many years. We now have an opportunity to demonstrate the meaning and significance of our friendship, as well as our good sense.

The purpose of the Coffee Agreement is to stabilize the wildly fluctuating coffee industry, and ultimately to help stabilize the economies and the governments who depend on this commodity. These ends serve our own interests. For the chronic instability of so large and so important an area as the one encompassed by the countries which depend upon coffee exports can, if left unchecked, eventually shake all of the Western Hemisphere, if not the world.

In Africa seven underdeveloped nations obtain from 30 to 50 percent of their foreign exchange earnings from coffee. Six Latin American countries depend on coffee for more than 50 percent of their export receipts, and the 14 Latin coffee-exporting countries receive an average of 25 percent of their export receipts from this commodity. In Latin America alone, more than 12 million people depend on coffee for their livelihood.

It is no answer to the vicious cycle of feast and famine which these countries endure with depressing regularity to hide behind the foreign aid program. Jose Figueres, the former President of Costa Rica, said:

Continuation of the cycle of low prices for commodities and bigger doses of foreign aid is like giving an anemic man a blood transfusion in one arm and draining it out of the other.

The people of Latin America need trade more than aid, in my judgment. But the avenues of commerce, in a just world, must be two-way streets. Nations need to sell as well as buy, particularly underdeveloped ones. The International Coffee Agreement will, when properly implemented, enable the coffee-producing nations of Latin America to sell their product and go about the business of diversifying their economies.

AN ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL OR AMERICAN OMBUDSMAN WOULD HELP CONGRESSMEN HELP THEIR CONSTITUENTS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF TRADITIONAL CONGRESSIONAL - CONSTITUENT RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced legislation, H.R. 4273, to create an Administrative Counsel of the Congress to help Congressmen help their constituents who have problems with the Federal Government.

I am pleased to say that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is introducing an identical bill in the other body today.

The chief purpose of this bill is to give Congressmen and their staffs more time to work on legislation and our great national problems by lifting some of the burden of dealing with the problems of individuals. Yet establishment of an Administrative Counsel of the Congress would not disrupt the existing congressional-constituent relationship.

I have called the Administrative Counsel an American ombudsman because it is an adaptation to our constitutional system and political traditions of the institution of ombudsman first established in Sweden in 1809. The ombudsman has proved so valuable in protecting the rights of citizens against bureaucratic abuses and errors that it has spread to Finland, Denmark, Norway, and New Zealand. A bill similar to H.R. 4273 is pending in the Utah State Legislature.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL WOULD INVESTIGATE AND HELP SOLVE CITIZEN'S PROBLEMS REFERRED TO HIM BY CONGRESSMEN

The bill provides that the Administrative Counsel would help Congressmen help their constituents in many of the cases which are the traditional subjects of constituents' appeals to Members—delayed social security payments, misconstrued veterans' laws, mistreatment in the Armed Forces, claims of discrimination in Government contracts, and the like.

Constituents would continue to write their Congressmen about these matters as they do now. The Member might choose to refer the constituent's problem to the Administrative Counsel. The Counsel would have a small staff of experts and specialists in the various aspects of administration which cause the most problems. These experts could look into the complaint on the basis of information supplied by the constituent or, at the Counsel's discretion, undertake their own investigation. The Counsel would have the investigatory power of a congressional committee and would be able to examine papers and records of the administrative office concerned, or question its employees.

The Counsel would transmit his findings and recommendations to the Congressman who referred the matter to him. In the vast majority of the cases, where individuals are being injured by administrative error or delay, by excessively strict interpretations of law, or by unreasonable administrative regulations, the Counsel's investigation and recommendation would probably be sufficient to obtain remedial action. However, if the administrative agency persisted in undesirable practices or policies despite the Counsel's recommendation, the Counsel could recommend appropriate legislative action in reports to both Houses of Congress. The Counsel is required to make an annual report. He may make special reports. These reports can be expected to receive widespread publicity and to summon the force of public opinion against the administrative abuses exposed in them.

In the countries with an ombudsman, it has been found that the ombudsman's right to publicize combined with his power to recommend action to parliament have made administrators strongly inclined to heed his recommendations.

In virtually all cases, the Congressman would reply to his constituent, as he does now, describing the resolution of the citizen's problem. Thus the beginning and the end of the case would remain firmly in the Member's hands. The Counsel would play his unobtrusive, yet effective, role in the middle of the case where the real time-consuming work is.

The role of the Counsel would become obvious only in the relatively few cases which became specific parts of the Counsel's reports. These, however, would undoubtedly be cases in which an individual Member would have been unsuccessful in objecting to maladministration. If the Counsel's publicity could bring a remedy both the citizen and the Congressman would be better off.

Of course, Congressmen would not have to refer cases to the Counsel. They could continue to handle them themselves. Members are also not required to use the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress or the legislative counsels of the two Houses. But, in fact, heavy use is made of these aids.

It would be of great importance to have an outstanding person as Administrative Counsel. The Nordic and New Zealand ombudsmen have been topflight people, including supreme court justices who resigned to become ombudsmen. The bill provides that the Counsel be appointed "without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness" by the Speaker of the House and President pro tempore of the Senate. While the 2-year constitutional life of the House requires a reappointment at 2-year intervals, it is anticipated that the Counsel would be repeatedly reappointed. He would be paid the same salary as Members of Congress.

The Administrative Counsel would not encroach on the jurisdiction of the Comptroller General concerning the legality of governmental expenditures. Nor would he have any jurisdiction with respect to the President, Members of Congress and their employees, judges,

officers of the District government, or certain other Federal employees.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL WOULD ALLOW MEMBERS TO BETTER LEGISLATORS, PROMOTE EFFICIENCY, HELP CITIZENS, AND IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION

As governments throughout the Western democracies have expanded their efforts to promote public welfare, the impact of the actions of the bureaucracy on individual citizens has increased continually. Programs such as social security, public housing, veterans' benefits, and so on, are full of possibilities for individual injustice if there are not readily accessible avenues for correcting administrative abuse or error.

In the United States, a citizen with a problem with the Federal administration is likely to write to his Congressman about it. He may also have an administrative appeal or a judicial remedy, but these may be costly, complex, or unknown to him.

The role Congressmen have assumed as the citizen's advocates against the bureaucracy is important and valuable in our system of government. It has helped to prevent injustices and to promote good administration. But the job of handling constituents' cases has become so burdensome that it is interfering with the primary job of Congressmen as legislators. The national problems we face today demand more time for thought and study and debate, yet the growing burden of casework allows us less.

The Administrative Counsel is not a cure-all. But it does promise additional time for members and their staffs to spend on legislation and national policy.

There are three other significant advantages of establishment of an Administrative Counsel.

First, the Administrative Counsel could do a better job of protecting the interests of constituents. The Members of this body particularly do not have staffs large enough to have a staff expert in each field of bureaucratic activity. The "jacks of all trades" in congressional offices often find themselves somewhat at the mercy of more knowledgeable administrators. The experts on the staff of the Administrative Counsel would be able to protect citizens' interests faster and better.

Second, handling casework on a centralized basis instead of in 535 separate offices would be more efficient and less costly.

Third, the Administrative Counsel would have a unique vantage point to spot causes and sources of citizens' difficulties with the Federal bureaucracy. With complaints spread out among 535 Representatives and Senators, improper procedures, inefficiency, or consistently rude and lazy officials may go undetected. Congressmen may be able to prevent injustices to the citizens who appeal to them, but the basic cause of the citizens' problems may go uncorrected while many individuals who do not appeal to their Congressmen suffer injustice. In recommending reforms to eliminate the causes of citizens' problems with the bureaucracy, the Counsel would constitute a second force for better administration, in addition to the per-

manent Administrative Conference of the United States created by Congress last year.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 4273

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Administrative Counsel Act".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the increasing complexity of the Federal Government has created difficulties on the part of private citizens in dealing with the Government, that there is a clear need for the Congress to be informed of the nature of such difficulties, particularly those of a recurrent nature, in order that remedial legislative action may be taken, and that, under existing procedures, such information is only sporadically available and frequently is inadequately developed or fails entirely to reach the appropriate legislative committees. The Congress further finds that the necessary and proper efforts of its individual Members to deal with these problems have increasingly become so burdensome as to constitute a serious impediment to the discharge of their other legislative duties.

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be an officer of the Senate and House of Representatives who shall be known as the Administrative Counsel of the Congress and shall perform such duties as are prescribed by this Act. He shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office, for a term which shall expire upon the commencement of the Congress succeeding the Congress during which he was appointed, except that he may continue to act during such succeeding Congress until he has been reappointed or his successor has been appointed. He shall receive the same salary as Members of Congress.

(b) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Administrative Counsel may appoint such assistants, clerks, and other personnel as may be necessary to carry on the work of his office.

SEC. 4. Upon the request of any Member of either House of Congress, the Administrative Counsel shall review the case of any person who alleges that he believes that he has been subjected to any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States, or that the determination or award of any such right or benefit has been, is being, or will be unreasonably delayed, as a result of any action or failure to act on the part of any officer or employee of the United States other than those exempted under section 6 of this Act. The Administrative Counsel may, in his discretion, confine his review of the case to the material submitted to him with the request for review, or may make such further investigation as he may deem appropriate. Upon the completion of his review, he shall report his conclusions and recommendations, if any, to the Member or committee by whom the claim was referred.

SEC. 5. All officers and employees of the United States, except those exempted pursuant to section 6, shall furnish to the Administrative Counsel such information regarding their activities within the scope of their official duties or employment as he may require of them, and the Administrative Counsel, or any of his assistants, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, records, files, or other documents, and the right to consult directly any officers or employees of the United States without securing the permission of their superiors.

SEC. 6. (a) This Act shall apply to all officers and employees of the United States except the following:

- (1) The President;
- (2) Members, officers, and employees of the Senate, the House of Representatives, or any committee or joint committee thereof;
- (3) Judges, clerks, commissioners, referees in bankruptcy, and other officers (other than attorneys as such) and employees of any court of the United States, regardless of whether such court is legislative or constitutional;
- (4) Officers and employees of the District of Columbia or any other local governmental unit not under the supervision or control of some other department or agency of the United States; and
- (5) Any other officer or employee of the United States whose activities are of such a nature that, in the discretion of the Administrative Counsel, the application of this Act thereto would be contrary to the public interest.

(b) For the purposes of this Act, the term "officers and employees of the United States" includes officers and employees of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 7. (a) The Administrative Counsel shall make an annual report to the Congress. Such report shall summarize his activities, shall include reviews of those individual cases which, in his judgment, should be brought to the attention of the Congress, and shall set forth such recommendations for legislation or further investigation as he may deem appropriate.

(b) The Administrative Counsel may, in his discretion, make an interim report on any occasion when he deems such action appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) Any report of the Administrative Counsel pursuant to this section shall be printed as a public document.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MR. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who love New York City have been saddened in recent years by the continuing decline of what we believed to be the greatest city in the world.

A team of New York Herald Tribune investigators has put together a series of articles on the crisis situation which has developed in New York. This series has covered the whole gamut of urban problems faced by America's largest urban center. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the first of that series which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 25, 1965:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—REASONS FOR OUT- RAGE AND REASONS TO ACT

(New York is the world's financial and cultural center, the Nation's tastemaker, and the home of the power elite, but to many of its 8 million citizens, it is no longer the greatest place in which to live. Discontent has always been a distinctive quality of the New Yorker—restlessly unwilling to accept the status quo—and in the past this discontent has been channeled into the tremendous creative civic energy which has given the city its dynamic character. But in the complex years since the end of World

War II the creative channels have clogged up. The city's simple problems require complex answers. And the complex problems seem to have no solutions at all. With reasonable outlets denied, the citizen's discontent has turned inward: to bewilderment, frustration, rage, and finally fear or indifference. A special Herald Tribune team—headed by Barry Gottehrer and including Barrett McGurn, Marshall Peck, and Claude Lewis—has spent the last half year investigating the deeply disturbing characteristics of a city in crisis, and, in this series of articles, presents its findings.)

POVERTY

It is a city in which poverty is everywhere and the gulf between the rich and poor grows greater and more insurmountable every day. To Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and aged whites, who know the killing effects ghetto life and isolation have on the mind as well as the body, the much-publicized war against poverty so far is just another political slogan with, according to Negro leader Bayard Rustin, the force of a cap pistol. Nearly one-fifth of the city's people now live in poverty conditions—families earning less than \$3,000 a year and individuals earning less than \$2,000 a year—many in cramped, inadequately heated, unsanitary, rat-infested apartments.

YOUTH

It is a city in which more than 70,000 youths now roam the streets, out of school, out of work or underemployed, untrained and uncaring. Because of its limited staff and its inability to keep trained personnel, the youth board, set up as the official city agency to deal with youth problems in 1947, has made very little headway despite a \$45 million outlay. And HARYOU-Act and Mobilization for youth, the new groups which offered so much hope for the future, already have become bogged down amid political, ideological, and financial controversy.

TRAFFIC

It is a city in which the daily traffic jams grow worse and worse and the hope for any improvement grows less and less. To many New Yorkers, particularly those forced to drive the Long Island expressways, the jokes about the massive traffic jams (in one, everybody leaves his car, the city pours cement over the deserted autos, and New York has solved its traffic problem) no longer are amusing. Despite the billions of dollars spent on highway construction, New York's roads and parking facilities are totally inadequate to accommodate the 1.5 million cars registered here and the 600,000 others that enter the midtown area each weekday.

MIDDLE CLASS

It is a city in which 800,000 middle-class whites, traditionally the heart of a metropolis and its economy, have fled to the suburbs since 1950 to be replaced by 800,000 Negroes and Puerto Ricans who, for the most part, are unskilled or semiskilled. And though the mayor and city officials decry this exodus, they have done little to keep the middle-class whites from leaving. "This is a white man's city," says Miriam Robinson, a Negro nurse. Yet not many white middle-class New Yorkers would agree.

HOSPITALS

It is a city in which the hospitals are supposed to be the best in the world, but most patients and many doctors know better. Officials say that there are some 3,000 more beds than are being used daily, but it is not at all unusual for people being forced to wait hours and even days to get into a city hospital. An 84-year-old woman, rushed by ambulance to a hospital after suffering a stroke recently, had to wait 8 hours and be transferred to three different hospitals before a bed could be found for her. "Maybe there are additional beds in the private rooms

and semiprivate, but we need all the ward space we can get," said one of the admitting doctors at Roosevelt Hospital. "There should be an up-to-the-minute listing in each hospital telling exactly where the vacant beds are, but there isn't any." This doctor had to phone seven hospitals before he found a bed for the aged woman at Metropolitan Hospital. While he telephoned, the woman waited alone and unattended in one of the emergency examining rooms. Yet even more critical than the problems of beds and services is the problem of health insurance. Despite a 33-percent increase in rates this summer and a 124-percent boost over the last 5 years, Blue Cross health insurance, the basic financial resource of the city's hospital service, is on the verge of setting its prices beyond the range of the people who need it most.

COMMUTERS

It is a city in which the commuter railroads that are needed to bring more than 200,000 people into midtown Manhattan 5 days a week are now closer to financial oblivion than they have ever been before. Commuter fares have skyrocketed on the New Haven, New York Central, and Long Island lines in the past few years, but losses continue. And, unless increased Federal aid and control are provided in the immediate future, the railroads may be forced to shut down commuter service completely. For the other New Yorkers, who travel by subway and bus into midtown Manhattan, getting to and from work each day has become a true survival of the fittest.

HOUSING

It is a city in which a public-housing program has been set up to cure at least one of the problems of poverty, but, because of limited funds, unlimited red tape, and little direction from the top, it seems to have created almost as many problems as it has solved. There are currently 520,000 people living in public housing, but there are more than 660,000 others now waiting to get in. At the rate that public housing has been constructed over the last 2 years (12,000 units or apartments since 1962), it would take someone more than 10 years to gain admittance to a public-housing project if he applied today.

URBAN RENEWAL

It is a city in which more than \$2.19 billion has been committed to urban-renewal projects since 1950 in an attempt to wipe out slums and provide decent low- and middle-income housing, but one in which the slums continue to spread, the ghettos remain, and there is still a critical shortage of low- and middle-income housing. To many New Yorkers, urban renewal has come to mean Negro or human removal, the shifting of a minority group from one slum to another.

WELFARE

It is a city in which half a million people, more than the number living in the States of Alaska, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, or Wyoming, are now receiving welfare with no solution in sight. "There is not a single thing we can do to keep this figure from increasing," says one welfare department worker. "For every case we close, another three or four are added to the rolls."

BUSINESS

It is a city in which the problems of automation and urbanization, which threaten the future of cities all over the world, are multiplied a thousand times. In the past 5 years, hundreds of businesses, both large and small, have deserted the city—and there appears to be no way and little effort on the part of city officials to halt this drain. Despite a temporary commercial building boom brought on by a change in the zoning code and by the World's Fair, construction is now on the decline with the trade unions currently reporting more than 15 percent un-

employment. What makes this problem even more critical is that it is precisely the employers of the unskilled and the semi-skilled who are deserting the city in frightening numbers. More than 80,000 manufacturing jobs alone have been lost in the city over the past 5 years. "Taxes, labor costs, insurance, and the city government's attitude have made Manhattan a nightmare for small businessmen," says one disgruntled dress manufacturer. "This is becoming a city with white-collar jobs and blue-collar people."

FINANCES

It is a city in which the financial needs grow increasingly critical every day and the sources of possible revenue increasingly difficult to find. The gigantic \$3.355 billion expense budget—only the Federal Government's is larger—has more than doubled under Mayor Wagner, creating the latest in a series of worsening financial crises for the city government. It has now reached the point where 14 percent of each year's expense budget—nearly \$1.3 billion a day—must go to pay debt service, and a \$350 million deficit has been predicted for 1966. The worsening problem: Where are the new taxes—the money to bridge the gap between the city's increasing expenses and limited sources of revenue—going to come from? The increased sales tax, boosted from 3 to 4 percent in 1963-64, has been a dismal failure, failing to approach predicted revenues. And the off-track betting proposal, even if it is approved by the Democratic-controlled State legislature this year, cannot be expected to provide substantial—or even adequate—revenue. The mayor's solution (and one he applies to almost every major city problem): allocating \$1 million of city money, setting up a special commission to study the problem, and convincing several important bankers and businessmen to lend their names (if not their undivided attention) to it. "It's all a game," says one of the mayor's aids. "We know we have fiscal problems and we know what we have to do—raise existing taxes or put in some new ones. But, most of all, we know that we must get more Federal and State help. But by setting up these commissions, the mayor gets the bankers and business leaders, many of them Republicans, involved. If they should ever come up with something new, then all the better. If they don't—and they rarely do—it's their failure, not the mayor's. And then, who says that he has to do anything with their proposals."

BUREAUCRACY

It is a city in which a giant bureaucracy flourishes, growing more unmanageable every day. The first charter revision in 26 years was approved in 1961, but the government and the people continue to struggle along seemingly unable to cut through the red tape, the politics, the duplication of time, money and departments, the inferior personnel, and the needlessly increasing costs that both separate and strangle them. "The basic problem in New York is that the government long ago ceased to be a government of and for the people it governs," says Jane Jacobs, author of "Death and Life of Great American Cities" and, labeled by her critics, the "Barbara Fritchie of the Slums." "The people of this city are being utterly disregarded. Our government doesn't listen to the people. It has become too insulated and too smug to care about their problems." One planning commission specialist has come up with a novel suggestion that is guaranteed never to see the light of day under the present city administration. "This city needs a lot of things but I'd like to use an IBM machine to figure out some chain of command for how to go about getting something done in this city," he says. "Then you'd know exactly where the power was and exactly where to go to get something accomplished."

HARLEM

It is a city in which an already troubled Negro population learned last summer that city hall could be made to listen—if not made to act. As a result of last summer's rioting and the fear that it might have become worse, Harlem now has a Negro police captain—and hopes that other concessions (perhaps a civilian police review board) are no longer out of the question. The responsible people of Harlem may have had nothing to do with the rioting but these people and the civil rights leaders, who found themselves totally unable to control or direct the demonstrations, have not failed to grasp the significance of it. "Time is running out for this city," says CCNY's Prof. Kenneth Clark. "The people of Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant are tired of promises and nothing else from city hall."

SCHOOLS

It is a city in which a gigantic school system is torn by overcrowding and substandard teaching, particularly in slum areas, becoming a political football for the mayor, the board of education, civil rights groups, and racists. Though the city has built more schools and classrooms under the present administration than it had in all of the previous administrations, the vocational schools have been allowed to become woefully outdated (more students drop out than graduate) and almost nothing has been done to prepare for an elementary school population in the Bronx and Manhattan that is now more than 65 percent Negro and Puerto Rican. "You don't worry about teaching these kids here," says one longtime Harlem teacher, who happens to be white. "You just keep them from killing each other and from killing you." With this attitude, it is not at all surprising that 24 percent of the youths who took the selective service exam, which approximates a 13-year-old equivalency test, in New York last year failed. The argument, favored by city officials, that the school dropout rate was greater 25 years ago than it is today overlooks one basic point. Twenty-five years ago youngsters dropped out of school to go to work or go into the Armed Forces. Today, with the seriously declining number of unskilled and semiskilled jobs, youngsters are dropping out of school not to go to work but to become members of the increasing number of the untrained and the unemployed.

POLITICS

It is a city in which the strike of nearly 7,000 welfare department workers and dozens of other city problems grow more critical every day, yet Mayor Wagner seems to spend most of his time wheeling and dealing for political control of a State legislature more than 160 miles away.

MAYORALTY

It is a city in which the major delights in expressing optimism, yet creates pessimism by his unwillingness to act boldly. Today, Robert F. Wagner is unquestionably one of the most popular mayors in the city's history but, even to his friends, he seems to be a man almost totally incapable or unwilling to make forceful or meaningful decisions. "I like the mayor—everybody likes the mayor," says one prominent New York educator, who voted for Mayor Wagner in each of his three campaigns for the city's top position. "He's always available and he's always pleasant. But when you leave his office or Gracie Mansion, it suddenly dawns on you that he hasn't really said a damn thing. These are extremely troubled times and the problems of this city are not going to solve themselves or disappear. We need a mayor who doesn't care about his image and his political popularity. We need a mayor who cares about the city and has the ability to cope with its problems."

COURTS

It is a city in which the court backlog has become so bad that 18 Brooklyn trial judges currently face 38,000 civil cases with more than 29,000 listed on jury calendars. The backlog is now so excessive that it takes 4 years to get many cases before a jury. The caliber of the city's judges and the manner in which they are chosen (picked by politicians and elected, frequently in face of opposition by the bar association) have both been severely criticized, and reforms have been suggested, but nothing has changed. "There are often rumors, difficult to substantiate, but persistent enough to cause concern, that there is a going price for a judgeship," wrote Herbert Brownell, former U.S. Attorney General and president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. "One year's salary is the reported figure in New York City. No honorable lawyer wants a judgeship at a price."

POWER ELITE

It is a city in which big businessmen complain about civic apathy and the way the city is run, but rarely do more than talk and lend their names to civic organizations and city commissions. When they do become actively involved (and this does not include lending their names to one of the mayor's countless commissions), as in the struggle for midtown parking garages, the trade center, and the Wall Street redevelopment, it has generally been an involvement born as much out of self-interest as it has been out of a love for the city. They prefer instead to complain that, even if New York could organize a supercitizens' council (as has been done so successfully in San Francisco and Philadelphia), it could accomplish little without the cooperation, if not the leadership, of the man in Gracie Mansion. "There has to be a coordination of civic effort, but there has been none here," says David Yunich, president of Macy's, New York, who favors the creation of a supercitizens' council. "A city where there is real desire for solutions can come up with a grassroots movement. A start must be made. But I think the mayor must first take the initiative." There are few businessmen or politicians who believe that Mayor Wagner ever will. "Another civic group?" says the mayor. "What for? If there's one thing the city does have, it's enough civic groups."

STUDIES

It is a city in which the foundations, the universities, thousands of civic groups, and the city government itself spend countless millions of dollars each year on studies relating to New York City (not infrequently studying the same thing) and then do little more than file the reports for posterity. It is only rarely that the civic groups get together on a single project—and this seems to be the way the mayor would like to keep it. By keeping the civic and business groups divided, interested for the most part in winning improvements for their own particular project or area, the mayor remains the single unifying force in the city.

POLICE

It is a city in which the police force has added more than 7,000 men in the past decade and is called "the best and most honest in the world" by Mayor Wagner. Yet the narcotics rate in New York has skyrocketed (half of the narcotics addicts in the United States now live in New York) and gambling, the numbers and prostitution continue to flourish. "One of the big problems with Negro kids is that they just don't have any respect for the law," says one white policeman. This is not difficult to understand. In Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant, corruption and the law do not always appear to be in conflict. In one after-hours place in Harlem, reefers are sold and smoked openly. In

another, prostitutes, some as young as 13, solicit openly and argue over price at the bar. "We don't worry about being raided," says Jimmy the bartender and bouncer, taking a bet on a number. "Some of our best customers are cops—white cops."

PRESS

It is a city in which the press alternates between praising and panning the mayor but, with few exceptions, limited by space and finances, offers little sustained, constructive criticism. One exception was a lengthy indictment in the magazine *Nation*, which documented a series of major city scandals. The article was thorough and hard-hitting and brought about immediate concern and momentary indignation when it appeared in late 1959. But, in the long run without the support of the city's other papers and magazines, it accomplished little. The same administration sits in city hall, seemingly more secure than ever before, and, if the corruption and scandal are no longer as extensive or as obvious, the problems of the city are a great deal worse.

POLITICIANS

It is a city in which the Republican Party assails the mayor and complains about the "inefficient and corrupt" administration, but, so far, has offered no leader and no program of its own. "OK, so they don't agree with the way I run the city," says the mayor. "But what do they offer in my place? In the years I've been mayor, the Republicans have never even really had a platform. They don't even come to the budget hearings any more. I wish they did. I'm willing to listen to anybody." Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, a young Republican mentioned increasingly as a candidate for mayor, does not dispute the mayor's charge. He suggests the creation of a "shadow cabinet," modeled after the British body, made up of experts in the party out of office and serving as a watchdog over the party in power. "I think that under Mayor Wagner New York has lost its will power, its great energy, and its great leadership," says the Congressman. "You hear a lot of people say that the city is too big to be governed by one man. I don't agree with that at all. It's just a cliché."

"But to run this city properly and get it going again, the mayor has to be very tough. He's got to ask for the moon and he's got to convince the people to make sacrifices. It will take a man who loves the city and a man who loves its people. If we don't get going again soon, New York will become a second-class city."

Barbara Ward, the noted British economist, is even more pessimistic. "If children were run down in the streets, something would be done," she said, during a speech last fall. "All over the world things are becoming intolerable, but we are tolerating them. Unless someone comes up with some jolly good solutions, the problems facing cities may become more lethal than the bomb."

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MR. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following: Today, I would like to introduce a resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day.

Such a bill was introduced during the last session of Congress but no action was taken. I am hopeful that the 89th Congress will be the one to honor the original inhabitants of this Nation.

The importance of this bill is realized when we glance back through the great history of our Republic and observe the contributions made by the Indian people to our heritage and to our present day culture. We can see a proud people, the first citizens of our land who have endured many hardships and many trials and have emerged as a responsible and patriotic section of our population.

The influence of the Indian is deeply engrained in our Nation. We must act to place the national and even the world spotlight on the Indian and thus, show our pride toward them. In this way, we can promote better understanding toward the American Indian. We can also help to advance the economic and social welfare of our Indian community.

CLOSING OF VA HOSPITALS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has ordered the closing of 11 hospitals, the consolidation of 17 regional offices, and the phasing out of 4 domiciliaries. I have asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delay any action until Congress can make a thorough study and investigation to make certain such closings will not curtail hospital or other care to any veteran. I do not want to see any action taken which would prove detrimental to our Nation's veterans.

I am particularly concerned about our State of New York, where we have 10 percent of the Nation's veterans. We have 2¼ million veterans and their dependents. The plan would affect my State as follows: the two VA hospitals at Castle Point and Sunmount would be closed; the VA hospital and domiciliary at Bath would be closed; the regional offices at Syracuse and Buffalo would be consolidated; and the functions of Brooklyn and Manhattan regional offices would be consolidated under one manager.

I am concerned that the closing of these facilities and the consolidation of others might impose a hardship on those who can least afford it—that it would result in hardship not only to the veterans themselves if they are moved to another distant locality, but also to their relatives who, in many instances, would find it impossible to visit these veterans in distant locations. The closing of these facilities would, no doubt, also result in additional financial burdens to public welfare agencies in New York because many of the patients or inmates will return to the area they formerly lived in rather than be moved to distant locations.

The elimination of the two hospitals and the domiciliary center in my State seem to me to be diametrical to the policy to establish additional nursing type beds. The attendant drop in employment and resulting economic effect on the communities where these installations are located would not be in keeping with the aims of our antipoverty program.

I realize the VA must periodically analyze and study their facilities in order to operate as efficiently and economically as possible. Certain changes are necessary from time to time to keep pace with science and medical research, which is certainly in the interest of our veterans. However, in recent years the VA has built additional hospitals, and we continue to build or improve or enlarge others. We should study all VA-proposed expansion programs and determine how much expansion might become necessary if these facilities are closed.

I am hopeful that Congress will enact a medical care program. It follows that such a program would bring an expanded and prolonged use of existing hospital facilities. Would this not mean that our local hospitals would have to accommodate larger numbers of patients? The result might be that veterans hospitals and domiciliaries, if closed, would only have to be reopened, at greater expense in the long run than keeping them open now and administering the necessary repairs and modernizations.

Various veterans' organizations and groups in my State have expressed opposition to the curtailment program and have stated that "in the face of the ever-growing need for medical care and hospitalization for many of the Nation's veterans, the elimination of 11 marginal hospitals will create considerable distress and hardship, particularly to veterans who will have to travel long distances for treatment and services."

Laws enacted by Congress establish the responsibility on the Federal Government to provide all required care to veterans disabled from military service. We owe it to them to provide the best possible hospitalization and care, and whenever possible, in facilities convenient to them and their families. Our veterans of World War I are advanced in age and our veterans of World War II are middle aged or beyond. This makes it appear to me that in years ahead the need for additional facilities will be greater.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the closing of these facilities held in abeyance until Congress has the opportunity to review and appraise the possible impact on the welfare of our veterans.

LITERACY TESTS AS QUALIFICATION FOR VOTING

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit literacy tests as a qualification for voting in State elections as well as Federal elections for citizens who have not been adjudged incompetent and who have completed the sixth grade.

Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited the discriminatory use of literacy tests in Federal elections and required that they be in writing and created a rebuttable presumption that an individual who had completed the sixth grade possessed sufficient literacy to vote in Federal elections.

My bill would specifically prohibit the use of literacy tests in State as well as Federal elections for those who have completed the sixth grade and who have not been adjudged incompetent.

Mr. Speaker, voter registration and the fact that many of our citizens have been denied this privilege, should be of immediate concern to all of us in this body. The right to register and vote is fundamental to democratic government and the Federal Government is responsible for the protection of that right. The purpose of my bill is to prevent an otherwise qualified citizen from losing his right to register and vote solely because of unreasonable literacy requirements.

It is a well-known fact that unreasonable literacy tests have been and are still being used unjustly to deny citizens the right to vote. How are we to safeguard and protect our people against the deliberate use of technicalities to deny them the right to vote because of race or color? I believe the most effective way is to establish an objective standard by which an individual's literacy may be judged, as I have proposed in my bill. This would eliminate the intrusion of bias and prejudice; it requires the determination of fact, rather than a judgment or an interpretation.

Mr. Speaker, education is a reliable gauge of literacy, but we should have a fair and just standard. My bill would specifically establish the minimum line at the completion of "the sixth grade in school accredited by any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

The community language in Puerto Rico is Spanish, but the capacity to understand and to communicate develops as well through one language as another, and English is taught in the schools in Puerto Rico beginning with the first grade. Therefore, pupils who have gone through the sixth grade have considerable command of English, sufficient to understand and write it well.

No one will quarrel with the contentions that voters should have certain basic equipment in order to vote intelligently. Certainly, the electorate should be aware of the issues. Literacy is a reasonable requirement to assure minimum understanding. I believe the demarcation point of "the sixth grade" proposed in my bill is reasonable.

I feel that the completion of a sixth-grade education is ample demonstration of literacy. We must not deny any citizen who is demonstrably literate the

right to register and vote in any election. To prevent such injustice, I urge early approval of my bill.

THE RETIREMENT OF ED REARDON

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MR. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, when the 89th Congress convened at the beginning of the year, a familiar face was missing from the House Press Gallery. For my good friend, Ed Reardon, had retired.

Ed Reardon served for many years with distinction as the Washington correspondent of the Herald-News, a daily newspaper which is published in Passaic, N.J., in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

Ed Reardon has served in the highest tradition of journalism. He has been painstakingly accurate, and he has never engaged in sensationalism or half-truths. As an individual, he is unfailingly kind and decent. While serving his newspaper in Washington, he came to be widely known and respected by many in the Nation's Capital and in the Halls of Congress. We will miss him, but we hope that Ed will be busy in retirement, enjoying all the good things life has to offer.

MORE SUPPORT FOR SHORTER CAMPAIGNS

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MR. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a staunch advocate of legislation to shorten presidential campaigns and as a sponsor of H.R. 96 and House Joint Resolution 16 which I have filed for this purpose, I was gratified to read a report of the speech made by Mr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. at the annual meeting of the Institute of Life Insurance in New York on December 8, 1964.

Mr. Stanton made several timely and important suggestions in keeping with the improvement of our election practices to bring them into line with the demands and realities of modern life and to take full advantage of the tremendous present day advances in electronic communications.

Mr. Speaker, the expression "too long, too expensive, too arduous" which I have often used in my arguments in favor of my proposal to limit presidential campaigns to 60 days was used effectively by Mr. Stanton in his comments concerning the 1964 campaign. With permission to extend my remarks and in

further support of my proposals to limit Presidential campaigns to 60 days, I include herewith a portion of Mr. Stanton's December 8, 1964 speech:

TOO LONG, TOO EXPENSIVE, TOO ARDUOUS

If the electorate was bored and disgusted, there is evidence that the candidates were exhausted and perhaps even remorseful. After the campaign was over, the Democratic Vice Presidential candidate said, "What we really find ourselves doing with these long, extended campaigns of 2 to 3 months is replaying old material. And it loses a quality of its spontaneity and its freshness, and therefore I think that you [the candidate] tend to become tired; the public becomes a little tired." His opponent, the Republican Vice Presidential candidate, agreed that the campaign was "too long, too expensive, too arduous, and too boring for the public."

The depressed level of the campaign of 1964 was reflected in the turnout on Election Day. Only 61.3 percent of eligible voters went to the polls, as compared to an alltime high of 64 percent 4 years ago, in 1960. And while the 1960 vote represented an increase of more than 11 percent in the number of voters casting their ballots over that of 1956, the 1964 vote amounted to an increase of only 1.5 percent over that of 1960, despite a 6 percent rise in the number of eligible voters. (Of the 1.5 percent increase in ballots cast, one-fifth was accounted for by the District of Columbia which was enfranchized for the first time since 1800.)

This could have come as no surprise to anyone who followed the uninspired and uninspiring use of communications in the 1964 campaign. Compared to the peak audience of 75 million that witnessed the Presidential debates of 1960, the peak audience of any political broadcast in 1964—the night before the election—was only 16 million. And the rate at which television audiences watched the other paid, set-piece political programs of 1964, compared to the average audience of 71 million for all four debates in 1960, is no less persuasive evidence that something is tragically wrong with the role that today's communications are permitted to play in American political life.

ALTERED CONTEXT OF POLITICAL LIFE

It takes no mystical insight to see where the trouble lies to a great extent. The fact of the matter is that, instead of using the great communications advances of our time, the political forces in this country have been resisting them—commanding them, like latter-day Joshuas commanding the sun, to stand still while the politicians do business at the old stand in the old way. And the citizen is expected to carry out electoral duties paced and dictated by the rapid complexities of the 20th century in accordance with the slow simplicities of the 19th. There is an ugly and dangerous anachronism in the facts of our scientific and political life. The Vice-President-elect put this bluntly enough after the election when he said, "we are going to have to catch up politically with the developments in science."

But we are not going to bring our political processes into line with the scientific realities of our time unless we face some elementary truths. Primary among these is the need for a clearheaded, realistically coordinated, and bona fide effort on the part of our political leaders and our political representatives to accept the fact that electronic communications have profoundly altered the context of political life today—and altered it to the good. And we need to adapt our old political processes to this new reality. We need this done now—when, since there is no campaign either current or immediately impending, there is no question of advancing or impeding the interest of any one party or of any one candidate.

PRISONERS OF AN UNWORKABLE RELIC

So far as the public interest goes, the people of this country are the prisoners of a discredited and unworkable legal relic of a generation ago: Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, which requires equal time to be given by broadcasting stations to all candidates of all political parties, major or minor, for an office—and there were 12 parties with candidates for the Presidency in 1964—if time is given to the candidates of any party for that office. It was the suspension of this legislation by joint congressional resolution for the 1960 Presidential and Vice Presidential campaign that made possible the Kennedy-Nixon debates and other types of broadcasts involving the candidates. It was the failure to suspend or repeal the section that, for all practical purposes, made similar confrontations between the major Presidential candidates in 1964 impossible.

Despite the almost unanimous editorial voice of American newspapers, despite the repeated requests of broadcasters, despite the demonstrably and widely acclaimed success of the 1960 suspension, there has been no resolute, conclusive legislative action getting rid, for once and for all, of the obstructive equal-time restrictions.

They will not be gotten rid of unless—and until—the electorate of this country speaks with such a loud and unmistakable demand that neither political stalling nor parliamentary juggling can silence or contradict it. For it is section 315 that keeps our political methods a century behind our communications.

SENSELESSLY PROLONGED CAMPAIGN

Once this log jam is broken, the way will be clear to taking a new look at the decrepit political practices that, having long outlived their point and their usefulness, hamper rather than advance the sensitive and difficult business of self-government.

Not the least of these outdated usages is the senselessly prolonged campaign between the conventions and the election. A hundred years ago, 3 months and more were necessary for the candidates to travel around the more than 3 million square miles of this country in order to be seen and heard by the voters. Even then, only a microscopic percent of the electorate ever saw any of the candidates or even heard them. Day after day of repetitious speeches, mile after mile of tedious travel, rally after carefully staged rally—after weeks of all this, the electorate was an emotional bundle of impressions far more often than an informed judge of qualifications. And yet 12 years have gone by since this outmoded and outworn ritual, with its unnecessary expense of time and constantly increasing expense of money, has been made obsolete by advances in electronic communications.

As long ago as January 1953, William S. Paley, chairman of CBS, put the case very clearly: "I would like to present for the earnest consideration of the two major political parties," Mr. Paley said, "the proposal that the national conventions should start around September 1. Allowing 3 weeks for the completion of the nominating process, this would leave approximately 6 to 7 weeks for the two candidates to present their cases to the people. The effective use of television and other media of communication, combined with the basic minimum traveling demands required by political necessity, would, in my judgment, enable the candidates to register a deep and pervasive impact on the electorate during this 7-week period." The experience of the 1960 presidential campaign suggests that, with the unfettered use of television, the campaign could be even shorter—perhaps no longer than a month.

PRICE FOR THE DELAY MOUNTS

The reform is now long overdue. Every year the price for the delay mounts—not only

in huge campaign costs, but also in terms of the suspension of normal legislative and executive functioning, uncertainty among other nations as to our future policies, and the bitterness at home that becomes inevitable as charges and countercharges stretch out interminably.

No constitutional and no statutory barrier stands in the way of the realistic and forward step suggested by Mr. Paley 12 years ago. Given the repeal of section 315, to rid electronic communications of the equal-time straitjacket, all that is required—beyond a clear look at the facts—is action by the two major party's national committees, which have been fixing the dates of nominating conventions for over a hundred years. During that span of time presidential campaigns have varied in length from 25 to 10 weeks.

THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT DESIGNED TO RETRAIN UNEMPLOYED WORKERS IN AREAS OF SERIOUS UNEMPLOYMENT

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MR. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 was designed to establish programs to retrain unemployed workers in areas of serious unemployment.

The requirement that the State and local government match these funds, while theoretically sound, all but nullifies this act in areas where it is most needed. These economically depressed areas are not only losing population but property values are dropping rapidly and in many cases large corporations, which paid a substantial portion of the taxes in the area, are disappearing either by a voluntary secession of operations or through bankruptcy.

The tax base loss from such economic developments is quite serious, and it is further decreased by the fact that a substantial number of the wage earners who, were they employed, would maintain normal income and property values for the business firms in the area, now contribute nothing to the economic health of the area.

If we are to make this program effective in areas where it is most needed, we must remove the requirement for State matching funds. The amendment to the act, which I have introduced today makes it possible to maintain a sound, well-rounded, manpower training act in those economically depressed areas which most need such a program.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, FEBRUARY 16

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, all of us need to be reminded that February 16 marks the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

Day. We need to be reminded of this anniversary because it marks the day when a valiant people succeeded in proclaiming their independence after centuries of subjugation and of rule by external authorities.

All the liberty-loving people of the world rejoiced on that day in February 1918 because of this significant democratic victory. The free peoples of the world observed with appreciation and admiration the rapid strides which this small and new Lithuanian Republic made in its form of government and in the social, economic, and cultural fields.

Unfortunately, it was for only a brief span of a score of years that this progressive young nation could enjoy its achievements and its independence. All too soon, its self-determination and its sovereignty were lost and its people made vassals of a bigger and more powerful nation.

Although successfully fighting Russian maneuvers and attempts to engulf it for 3 years, Lithuania was illegally incorporated into the Soviet Union as its 14th republic.

Since this event, the plight of the people of Lithuania has been and is today tragic. Almost overnight the progress made and the institutions developed under the banner of equality and freedom were wiped out.

The Soviet Union stands before these people and their relatives who have fled to freedom elsewhere as a tyrant and a bullying oppressor. The United States and other freedom-loving nations have never recognized the legality of this Soviet steal. I trust that we never yield to any persuasions to recognize the infamous act of the U.S.S.R. in swallowing up a proud and free nation which gave such promise as did Lithuania.

Today as never before we need to continue to maintain our guard to prevent similar illegal Communist moves being enforced against other nations of the world. This Lithuanian Independence Day anniversary should make us more determined to combat Communists and communism in all its evil intentions. This day should remind us not only of those great men and women again living under foreign domination in Lithuania but it should remind us of that fine segment of American citizens—the Lithuanian-born Americans and the Americans born of Lithuanian parents. We join them in celebrating this independence day and we congratulate them on the great and constant contribution which they continue to make to our country. On this anniversary we renew our pledge to do our utmost to hasten the day when once more Lithuania can truly celebrate its independence day.

HORTON AMENDMENT FOR PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY AND SUCCESSION

MR. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MR. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1963, the late Senator Estes Kefauver opened an inquiry into presidential inability pleading for statesmanship. He said:

We are very fortunate that this country now has a young, vigorous, and obviously healthy President. This will allow us to explore these problems in detail without any implication that the present holder of the office is not in good health.

The essence of statesmanship is to act in advance to eliminate situations of potential danger. * * *

Before the year was out, both the Senator from Tennessee and the "young, vigorous, and obviously healthy President" to whom he had referred were dead. The lessons implicit in this ironic twist of circumstances are too apparent to require extended elaboration. No one, regardless of station, has anything more than a day-to-day lease on life. We are in all respects tenants at will or sufferance.

Despite universal awareness of this grim imperative and notwithstanding the classic examples of Presidents Garfield and Wilson, the Congress has comforted itself as if the facts were otherwise. Under the impact of each succession or tragedy involving our Nation's highest officers, we have marched up the hill of legislative action firm in our resolve to find a solution. As the emergency subsided, we have marched down again bearing only unfulfilled promises.

In Dallas, as on seven previous occasions, a Vice President became President as a result of the incumbent's death. Although there was some little discussion about what he succeeded to—the office or the powers and duties—President Johnson took an oath to become President.

But what happens when a President is incapacitated for some reason and is unable to perform his duties? Can the Vice President act in his place? Who determines whether the President is incapable of acting? Who decides when he has recovered?

The Constitution's vagueness in these particulars has occasioned perplexity and discomfiture for more than a century. The circumstances surrounding the death of President Kennedy have taught us that we can no longer afford the uncertainty that presently exists.

I have today introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing a solution to the problems of presidential inability and succession. Under the terms of my proposal, the inability of the President may be established by a declaration in writing of the President. Similarly, it would provide that the ability of the President to resume his powers and duties also shall be established by his declaration in writing. To insure that the President may regain his powers and duties as soon as he is able to discharge them after relinquishing them himself to the Vice President, I have included language providing that the President may resume his duties and powers immediately upon declaring his inability at an end.

In the event that the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet or such other body as Congress shall provide do not concur in the decision of the President, the matter would be resolved by the veto of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress. Should the House and Senate fail to act promptly, the President would automatically resume his powers and duties 10 days after declaring the termination of his inability.

In the event the President fails or is unable to declare himself incapacitated, it may be established by the Vice President with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet or by such other body as the Congress may provide.

In order to still the recurrent controversy that accompanies each succession, the proposal would provide that in the event of death, resignation, or removal of the President, the Vice President shall succeed to the office for the unexpired term.

Because of the transformation of the Vice-Presidency from an office of obscurity to one of growing influence and national prominence, it is important that it be filled at all times. Under my proposal, when a vacancy occurs in the vice-presidential office, the President would be authorized to nominate a person who, upon confirmation by a majority of the Congress, would become Vice President for the unexpired term.

Mr. Speaker, divine providence has given us a renewed opportunity for statesmanship. To miss the opportunity again could amount to a mortal omission.

HORTON BILL FOR PROTECTION OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the important recommendations made to Congress by the Warren Commission was that legislation be enacted making it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President, the Vice President, any officer next in the line of succession to the Presidency, and President-elect, or the Vice-President-elect. Similar provisions are needed to protect members of the President's Cabinet and Members of Congress as well.

Bills for this purpose, including my proposal of November 27, 1963, were submitted in the Second Session of the 88th Congress, but action was not taken. One of them passed in both the House and Senate as long ago as 1902, but failed of enactment by disagreement in conference between the House and Senate. Such a bill should be enacted now.

The Senate sponsor of the bill introduced in 1902, Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, spoke as follows on the reason for making such homicidal attacks punishable under Federal law:

What this bill means to punish is the crime of interruption of the Government of

the United States and the destruction of its security by striking down the life of the person who is actually in the exercise of the executive power, or of such persons as have been constitutionally and lawfully provided to succeed thereto in case of a vacancy. It is important for this country that the interruption shall not take place for an hour.

Congress long ago made it a Federal offense to attack or murder various categories of Federal employees, including Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, customs agents, and postal inspectors. By this bill the full resources of the Federal Government would be brought into action in case of any future attack upon the President or those in the line of succession to him, just as they now may be brought to bear if those lesser officials I have named are subjected to murderous violence.

The Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate properly waited for the recommendations of the Warren Commission in this matter. The recommendation has now been made unequivocally. The case for making physical attack upon the President and those in the line of succession a Federal crime is so clear that there is no occasion for delay. Even if there had been no tragedy at Dallas and no failures on the part of State authorities in the custody of the alleged assassin, it would still be eminently desirable to extend the added protection of a Federal statute around the President and all those who would succeed him in the event of his death or disability.

If this bill is enacted, it will mean that Federal law-enforcement officers must investigate such crimes against our highest officials. The Warren Commission report has noted that, as it is now, such Federal agencies as the FBI participate in investigations of the heinous crime of presidential assassination "only upon the sufferance of the local authorities." Moreover, the Commission has pointed out that the enactment of this bill would "insure that any suspects who are arrested will be Federal prisoners, subject to Federal protection from vigilante justice and other threats."

We have a duty to the memory of the late President to enact this bill. We have a duty to the administration of criminal justice by our Federal Government to enact this bill. We have a duty to the preservation of our constitutional system of government to enact this bill.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation—recommended by the President—which will again amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

You and the Members of this House will recall, I am sure, that when I asked your support for the original Manpower Development and Training Act program, in February 1962, I stated that "this is the first of many steps we must take if we hope to eventually eliminate our unemployment problem."

In December of 1963 I requested the support of the Members for amendments to this act as the first year's experience in administering the program had revealed the need for providing basic academic education—along with occupational training—if we hoped to reach the hard-core unemployed. Other changes were made at that time also, and all were directed toward eliminating roadblocks discovered in our attempt to retrain the unemployed. These were some of the "additional steps" I had said we would probably have to take.

Today I am introducing additional amendments which we have found to be necessary if we hope to enjoy full employment in this Nation.

The Manpower Development and Training Act has proved that it can get our unemployed workers back into the active labor market. The records show that between 70 and 80 percent of all those retrained under this program are gainfully employed. Not only have these people been made active participants in our economy but, above all, they have regained their self-respect, for they were all eager to return to the ranks of the taxpayers rather than remain on the public relief rolls.

Only last week the city of Pittsburgh—a part of which is in my congressional district—reported that retraining courses for jobless workers are saving the taxpayers of the city \$35,000 a month in relief payments. I am sure that similar conditions exist in the districts of many other Members.

The continuation of this program is certainly necessary and, I am happy to say, it has gained the support of all segments of our Nation—industry, labor, education, government, and even the average citizens who belong to no specific group or organization.

Because of its noncontroversial nature, I anticipate early passage of this legislation.

The need for its uninterrupted continuation is mandatory and, for this reason, the Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, has scheduled public hearings on these amendments starting tomorrow, February 4. The Secretary of Labor, the Honorable Willard W. Wirtz, will be our opening witness; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, will testify on February 5; with Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, the legislative director for the AFL-CIO, scheduled to testify on February 10.

Additional hearings will be scheduled, and it is my hope that in the very near future, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will be reported to the House for final passage.

With the unanimous consent of the House, I am appending to my remarks a brief explanation of the amendments to

the Manpower Development and Training Act proposed by the administration:

OUTLINE OF PROVISIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

1. Termination date: Removes the June 30, 1966, termination date of the title II provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

2. Job development programs: Directs the Secretary to stimulate and assist job development programs to fill service needs which are not being met because of a lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment.

3. Experimental and demonstration programs: Expands the Secretary's research authority under title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act so that he may undertake experimentation and demonstration projects, and make grants to or contract with appropriate organizations for such purposes.

4. Labor mobility demonstration projects: Extends authority to conduct such projects for 2 more years, increases appropriations for such projects from \$4 million to \$5 million a year, removes the language which restricts the type of relocation expenses covered by the section to transportation costs and grants to 50 percent of such costs, adds provisions dealing with loans, and makes the provisions a part of title I, repealing section 208 accordingly.

5. Trainee bonding demonstration projects: Further amends title I to provide for demonstration projects to assist in the placement of trainees who have difficulty in securing bonds required for employment. Not more than \$200,000 for fiscal year 1966 and \$300,000 for fiscal year 1967 is authorized for such projects.

6. Training allowances:

(a) Extends period of training allowance support from 1 to 2 years.

(b) Changes eligibility requirements to permit single persons without dependents to receive training allowance.

(c) Increases training allowances by \$5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of six.

7. Revision of limitation on number of youths who may receive training allowances: The act presently provides that not more than 25 percent of those receiving training allowances may be under the age of 22. This provision is amended to enable the Secretary of Labor to make such adjustments as administrative necessity may require.

8. Transportation allowances: Permits the payment of transportation allowances for daily commuting between the residence and the place of training.

9. Outside work for on-the-job trainees: Permits on-the-job trainees to engage in up to 20 hours of outside work without a reduction in their training allowance.

10. Matching funds: Matching for training allowances and HEW training programs may be combined and is put on a 90-10 basis. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind.

11. Appropriations:

(a) The present monetary limitations in section 304 of the Manpower Act on authorizations authorized for each title are replaced by an open-end authorization for the whole act.

(b) Makes it clear that costs of training allowances as well as institutional costs approved in any fiscal year may be paid out of funds appropriated for that fiscal year. Also permits the non-Federal contribution to be based on the matching requirement in existence at the time the training program is approved. (Thus, training programs approved before June 30, 1965, will not require matching by the States, even though payments to States are made after that date.)

12. Area Redevelopment Act: Authorizes special funds under the Manpower Act for

training programs in areas designated as redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act to be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and HEW pursuant to the MDTA, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce and with full Federal financing. The need for the separate training provisions now in the Area Redevelopment Act is thus eliminated and the training requirements in all areas can be conformed to the maximum extent practicable.

13. Miscellaneous: Technical changes are made in the method of computing the average weekly unemployment compensation payment in the States, upon which weekly training allowances are based.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), for 20 minutes, on February 4.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), for 30 minutes, on February 3.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 5 minutes, on Thursday, February 4, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FLYNT.

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. TALCOTT.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COOLEY.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 701. An act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall in the Senate during the 80th and 81st Congresses; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

490. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on supply support deficiencies contributing to high deadline rate of air defense equipment at an overseas location, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

491. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate maintenance and supply support of aviation units of the Eighth U.S. Army, Korea, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

492. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate maintenance and supply support of aircraft of the Seventh U.S. Army, Europe, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

493. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 858 (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

494. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to make uniform for all commodities, for which a marketing quota program is in effect, provisions for reducing farm acreage and producer allotments for falsely identifying, failing to account for disposition, filing a false acreage report, and for harvesting two crops of the same commodity produced on the same acreage in a calendar year; and to provide in the case of peanuts and tobacco for credit for penalties paid on marketings against penalties incurred for false identification or failure to account; to the Committee on Agriculture.

495. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a copy of the 14th Annual Report of Selective Service for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 10(g) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

496. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

497. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on weaknesses involving primarily the disposition of surplus nonfat dry milk, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

498. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on increased costs due to failure to obtain competition in procurement of electronic parts on qualified products lists at the Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, Defense Supply Agency, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

499. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs resulting from the use of statewide personnel in civilian positions at naval installations on Guam, Mariana Islands, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

500. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide cost-of-living allowances for judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska or Hawaii"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

501. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in their behalf, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

502. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the 48th Annual Report of the U.S. Tariff Commission for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 3818. A bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONAGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of Special Study Mission to Europe 1964 (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 4224. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4225. A bill to correct inequities in the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act and in other laws governing civil service retirement benefits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 4226. A bill to repeal retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4227. A bill to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 4228. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 4229. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery below but

as near the Wolf Creek Dam, on the Cumberland River, near Jamestown, Ky., as is feasible and practicable; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 4230. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4231. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4232. A bill to authorize the President to recognize the Union Army of the Centennial, Inc., as a nonprofit organization consisting of reactivated military units that were active during the American Civil War 1861-65 and loyal to the Union. This organization being established to commemorate the American Civil War and designed to observe this period and afterwards with appropriate ceremonies and activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4234. A bill to repeal the Federal excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage and handbags, general telephone service, general admissions, transportation of persons by air, and safe deposit boxes, effective for periods after March 31, 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4235. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 4236. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, in computing annual income for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain pensions, certain payments received on account of disability shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4237. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend section 612(e) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of outpatient medical services to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4239. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,500 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4240. A bill to amend section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of the compensation of chaplains employed by the Veterans' Administration shall be considered as a rental allowance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4241. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 4242. A bill to establish a Commission on Congressional Reorganization, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FALLON (by request):

H.R. 4243. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to extend construction authority for facilities at Guam and the Virgin Islands of the United States (76 Stat. 87; 19 U.S.C. 68); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4244. A bill to provide that cigarettes sold in interstate and foreign commerce shall be packaged and marked so as to bear a warning that they may be dangerous to health and to show the nicotine and tar content of the cigarettes in each package; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4245. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954 as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4246. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Senior Citizens within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4247. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4248. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4249. A bill to prohibit literacy tests with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4250. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to authorize urban planning grants for areas affected by Federal treaties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4251. A bill to provide that any civilian agency which contemplates moving or closing any of its installations shall notify the Members of Congress concerned and shall afford an opportunity for public hearings with respect to such contemplated action; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 4252. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Herbert Hoover National Monument in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4253. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 4254. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4255. A bill to amend the Unemployment Tax Act so as to exempt from coverage thereunder service performed in the employ of certain tax-exempt agricultural or horticultural organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4256. A bill to amend section 883 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to exemption from taxation of earnings of ships under foreign flag; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4257. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4258. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States, members of the President's Cabinet, and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the taxable year of a partnership with respect to a deceased partner shall close as of the date of his death unless the successor in interest of such deceased partner elects not to have such year close; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit corporations to qualify as real estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 4261. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4262. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4263. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4265. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises (now exempt) engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing of clothing or fabrics which compete substantially in the same metropolitan area with similar enterprises not exempt and to lessen unfair competition; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 4266. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4267. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make the robbery of a cooperative bank which is a member of the Federal home loan bank, a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4268. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4269. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the silver content of certain coins of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4270. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to remove therefrom the requirements for State matching funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4271. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 4272. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4273. A bill to provide for an Administrative Counsel of the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 4274. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life of the Honorable Sam Rayburn and to assist in the support of the Sam Rayburn Library; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 4275. A bill to continue the Commission on Civil Rights on a permanent basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4276. A bill to provide for declaratory judgment procedures in cases involving refusal of witnesses to testify or produce papers before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4277. A bill to punish the killing, attempted killing, or assaulting of the President of the United States and other high officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4278. A bill to amend section 2(2) of the National Labor Relations Act to provide that the definition of "employer" therein shall include certain corporations or associations operating a hospital; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4279. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to provide relocation payments for persons displaced from their places of residence or business as a result of construction financed thereunder; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4280. A bill to amend part B of title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide relocation payments for persons displaced from their places of residence or business as a result of construction thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4281. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 4282. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for an individual member of a recognized religious sect who is conscientiously opposed to acceptance of benefits because of his adherence to the established tenets or teachings of such sect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4283. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain forms of nickel be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4284. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia to provide for the financial protection of cer-

tain persons suffering injury as a result of the operation of a motor vehicle by uninsured motorists; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4285. A bill to strengthen the Motor Vehicle Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4286. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent duplication of benefits based on disability in cases where the disabled individual receives workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4287. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 4288. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for certain additional hospital employees in California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 4289. A bill to permit Federal savings and loan associations to make loans for the acquisition of major household durable goods and furnishings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4290. A bill to permit Federal savings and loan associations to make loans for vocational education to the same extent as they are permitted to make such loans for academic education; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 4291. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4292. A bill to provide for the protection, preservation, and maintenance of the historic buildings and area of the Washington Navy Yard in the Nation's Capital, and the development of the area for the exhibition of historic ships and weapons, for the benefit of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 4293. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4294. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRALEY:

H.R. 4295. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 4296. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 4297. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4298. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 4299. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 4300. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 4301. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 4302. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4303. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4304. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.J. Res. 269. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the apportionment of districts from which members of subordinate State units of government are to be elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.J. Res. 270. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.J. Res. 271. Joint resolution to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and purses and handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 272. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to apportionment of the membership of State legislatures and of subordinate governing units of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 274. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 275. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 276. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution authorizing the First Cavalry Division Association to erect a monument in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 166. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and other Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H. Res. 176. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discontinuance of air service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H. Res. 177. Resolution to urge the President of the United States to cancel all action in connection with the closing of veterans hospitals awaiting study by the subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 178. Resolution to urge the President of the United States to cancel all action in connection with the closing of veterans hospitals awaiting study by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H. Res. 179. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H. Res. 180. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H. Res. 181. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 182. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Res. 183. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 184. Resolution condemning persecution of national and religious minorities in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 185. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. Res. 186. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study the operation of hospital facilities by the departments, agencies, and instrumental-

ities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H. Res. 187. Resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 188. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to direct the Secretary of Commerce to include a portion of U.S. Highway 95 in the Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 4305. A bill for the relief of Lee Kam Jon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 4306. A bill for the relief of Maja Thomsen Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4307. A bill for the relief of Mimi Abadi, Zaki Ezra Abadi, Ezra Abadi, Rachel Abadi, Meyer Abadi, Rosette Abadi, Hayem Abadi, Albert Abadi, and Eliahu Abadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4308. A bill for the relief of Oi-Ling Ma, Kwok-Wai Ma, Yui-Chiu Ma, Sai-Mi Ma, and Sai-Wan Ma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4309. A bill for the relief of Tong Yung Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4310. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew B. Kasprzyk and Genevieve Kasprzyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO (by request):

H.R. 4311. A bill for the relief of Teresina Fara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.R. 4312. A bill for the relief of Dr. Amin A. Faris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4313. A bill for the relief of Emille Antoine Stergiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 4314. A bill for the relief of Elaine Minerva Hylton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4315. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Lawrence Nestor against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4316. A bill for the relief of Hisae Otsu Coleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4317. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Rappa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4318. A bill for the relief of Vinton Walker Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4319. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey certain lands in Saline County, Ark., to the Dierks Forests, Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 4320. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Mistica Adornetti and Sister Elena Brogno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4321. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Boscarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 4322. A bill for the relief of Harry Nicolas Vakalopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4323. A bill for the relief of Gorgonio B. Policar, Jr., M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4324. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 4325. A bill to authorize the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to rent certain property in the District of Columbia for certain office purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Borivoj Divicic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4327. A bill for the relief of Brenda Patricia Fawkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 4328. A bill for the relief of Lawrence C. Fincher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4329. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabel Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4330. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Spataro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 4331. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of the Algonac Manufacturing Co. and John A. Maxwell against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 4332. A bill for the relief of the Students' Association of the University of Texas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4333. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late William F. Valters a commission as second lieutenant, Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4334. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ofra Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4335. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isabel Remedio Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4336. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hottica Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4337. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Pichon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4338. A bill to authorize the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to rent certain property in the District of Columbia for certain office purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4339. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Kirovski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 4340. A bill for the relief of Virginia Clemente Coelho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4341. A bill for the relief of Primo Meconi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4342. A bill for the relief of Guido Aquilini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4343. A bill for the relief of Farida Hanna Hazbon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4344. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kodungalore Janaki Warner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Dr. James P. Wesberry, pastor, the Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Once again, our Heavenly Father, we are grateful for the privilege of being in our Nation's Capitol, with its giant dome of architectural beauty, its crowning statue of freedom, and this sacred Chamber where a just and adequate edifice of law is built upon the heritage of our fathers.

We come humbly to unite our prayer, with those of multiplied millions of our fellow citizens, on behalf of each Member of the U.S. Senate, the Vice President, the Chaplain, the clerks, and all others who share and bear with them the heaviest governmental responsibility on earth.

Grant, we beseech Thee, most gracious God, unto these, Thy servants, in whose hands rest the welfare and virtue of the people to make or mar, divine wisdom, that their decisions may be righteous; divine guidance, that no ill will shall befall them or us; divine sympathy, that they may serve the best interests of all the people; and the counsel of Thy Holy Spirit, that they may know themselves to be Thy ministers.

Give Thou strength and health and Thy special providential care to the President of the United States.

Fill each of our hearts, we pray, with the love of God and the daring of Thy kingdom in the perennial and holy warfare for the freedom, justice, and rights of people everywhere. Renew our vision, O God, of the possible future of our country, and set our hearts on fire with new determination to do Thy will and to speed the coming of Thy kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 2, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; and

H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.